

CHAPTER IV.

IDOLATRY.

“TURN thee yet again, and thou shalt see greater abominations than these,”¹ it was said to Ezekiel,—

“when by the vision led,
His eye survey’d the dark idolatries
Of alienated Judah.”

We have been led in connection with the subject of the mass, to the contemplation of one part of Popish idolatry. But it is only a part. The abominations are manifold, and so prevalent that it is marvellous how the system should ever, except from those who are interested in the falsehood, receive the name of Christianity.

The charge of idolatry is one which the controversialists of Rome manifest a peculiar anxiety to repel,—sensible perhaps that it is singularly odious as brought against a Church which arrogates to itself an exclusive title to the name of Christian, and judging wisely of its fitness to take hold of the popular mind.

It is not in any vague, indefinite or figurative sense that the term idolatry is applied to much of the Popish religion: and with reference to her idolatry, more than to all the other vices and abominations fostered by her system and prevalent within her pale or amongst her clergy, is the Popish Church designated in the prophetic Scriptures as “the Whore,” and as “Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and abominations of the Earth,” and said to have “made the inhabitants of the earth drunk with

¹ Ezek. viii.

the wine of her fornication." For as lawful and godly marriage is the Scripture emblem of the connection subsisting betwixt the Lord and his Church, so adultery and whoredom are Scripture emblems of all departure from the worship of the true God to follow after idols, and idolatry in all its forms is symbolized by the terms usually employed to designate uncleanness. It is not unworthy of observation, however, that both the abominations from which the emblems are derived, and those to which they are applied, prevail together in the great apostasy of the Christian era, as they prevailed together amongst the Jews of old in the days of national depravity and rebellion against God.

This charge of idolatry, which, moreover, forms one principal ground of the further charge of apostasy brought by us against the Church of Rome, and of our belief that in her we behold the great apostasy predicted in the second chapter of Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, is founded upon several things or classes of things, in each of which by itself abundant guilt may be proved against her.

I. The Adoration of the Host in the sacrifice of the mass, with all its befitting adjuncts of pompous, scenic, gross, paltry, and ridiculous forms, utterly unworthy of any purpose better than the idolatrous purpose which they fulfil. But of this enough has been said in last chapter.

II. The worship of angels.

III. The worship of saints,—real or supposed,—who are represented as a sort of peerage in the spiritual kingdom, and are exalted so high as to interfere with the dignity and exclusive prerogatives of the only King; sometimes real personages like the heroes of antiquity, who after their death were honoured as demigods, but in other instances as imaginary as any of the divinities of mythological fable,—and when real personages, sometimes those who really deserve to be held in most affectionate and respectful remembrance by the whole Christian Church, as the apostles and primitive martyrs, of whose names Popery takes advantage, whilst their doctrines and their writings are discarded, and whom we may suppose to look down from heaven

with a holy abhorrence upon the homage paid to them,—and sometimes persons of the most opposite class, wretched anchorites, the slaves of self-conceit and superstition, or cold-blooded butchers of true saints, like Dominic,—unrepentant villains whose crimes the infallibility of Rome has much ado to cover from the eyes of men.

IV. The worship of the Virgin Mary, to whom is conceded a rank and dignity far superior to that of the other saints, with the blasphemous title of the Mother of God, and whose worship at the present moment, even more than at any former time, threatens to supersede all worship of God and of Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

V. The worship of Images.

VI. The worship of Relics.

VII. Miscellaneous abominations:—Superstitious practices connected with the supposition of a peculiar virtue communicated to or residing in certain common creatures,—the use of the sign of the cross,—the use of holy water,—the baptising of bells,—the consecrating of churches,—exorcisms,—vain repetitions, and so forth.

The field is large, and of necessity we must examine some parts of it more slightly than others, whilst some must be wholly omitted.

But here it may be remarked that the same state of mind is requisite for one and all of these things, though one mind may be to a greater degree prostrated, debauched, and degraded than another, and therefore one man may sink deeper than another in that idolatry which is common to both. A certain prostration of reason is required before a man can worship a wafer,—the same prostration of reason fits him for worshipping an image. And although Papists are often careful enough to assert that they do not worship the images, but only the beings represented by these images,—an assertion which, were it granted, would still leave only a more refined and not less dangerous Paganism in the place of Christianity,—and that they do not believe any divinity, or life, or virtue, to be resident in the

images themselves, yet it is not easy to see how a people can be supposed to divest themselves of all idea of divinity, or life, or virtue resident in the images which they set up before them when they worship, who have been accustomed to regard the highest Divinity, the eternal Godhead, as fully resident in what seems, as even they admit, to be only a bit of paste, and actually believe it changed into the body, soul, and divinity of the Redeemer. And, to borrow a remark from Isaac Taylor, it matters not much what may be the refined speculations of men who are capable of them, but what are the sentiments of the crowds of devotees who surround the shrines in Naples or in Ireland: whilst it ought to be borne in mind that Popery has always laboured to unfit the great body of the people for any refined speculations whatever, and it has only been when driven to it by a pressure from without that she has consented to make a merit of necessity and to engage in the work of general education.

"In the view of every spiritually informed Christian," says the author to whom I have just referred, "the doctrine of the mediatorial office and intercessory work of Christ occupies a place which sternly excludes the remotest approach of the doctrine of the intercession of the Virgin, or of departed saints and martyrs. And such a mind rejects, as by instinct, the foolish extenuations that have been, and are now offered in defence of these blasphemous corruptions; nor does it wait to look abroad for evidence touching the degrading Paganism for which that doctrine has uniformly made way.

"If we have learned our religion from Christ and his apostles, we do not need to be told that, where the people have been taught to present their supplications to 'the Indulgent Mother,' and to make saints and angels their deprecators, and to confide in the power of crossings, crosses, and holy bones,—there, every characteristic of polytheism invariably presents itself. All this is indeed mournfully true, but apart from the knowledge of it, the Christian heart spurns these infernal delusions at the very instant of hearing them propounded, and it does so with a

mingled emotion of contempt, indignation, and dread. They are errors than which none can be of worse, or of more certain ill consequence,—they are errors (and this can be said of few) pure of every alleviating mixture of truth,—errors which, like some poisons, are of mortal efficacy, even administered in the minutest quantities."¹

Now let us listen to the most authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome.

The following are the twentieth and twenty-first articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV. :—

"I do likewise believe that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do offer prayers unto God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration.

"I do most firmly assert, that the images of Christ, of the blessed Virgin the Mother of God, and of other saints, ought to be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration ought to be given to them."

This creed or "Profession of Catholic Faith," as the Papists prefer to call it, concludes with these words—

"I, N. N., do at this present, freely profess, and sincerely hold this true Catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire, and unviolated, with God's assistance, to the end of my life."

So that the Popish Church is committed, by all the authority of this document, to the doctrine that no one can be saved who does not hold that due honour and veneration ought to be given to the images of the Virgin and other saints,—though the expression "due honour and veneration ought to be given" seems to be intentionally slippery, nay, is certainly so, being derived from one of the decrees of Trent, and adopted in the way of compromise,—and to the doctrine less cautiously expressed, that the saints themselves ought to be worshipped and prayed unto, or "honoured and invoked," as Bishop Challoner and other Popish authorities prefer to translate it,² and that they

¹ Taylor's *Ancient Christianity*, &c., II, 230, 231.

² See a Translation of the Creed or Profession contained in "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine," &c. "By the Ven. and Right Rev. Richard Challoner," lately republished in Glasgow, "with the approbation of the

offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be had in veneration. And this is what the Papists of Scotland and other parts of the British dominions are taught to believe and to hold, this creed of Pope Pius being familiar to them, and one of the tracts apparently in most general circulation amongst them being Bishop Challoner's exposition of it, called "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine as contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius IV."

But with this we may compare the Decree of the Council of Trent.

"The holy Synod commands all bishops and others, to whom is entrusted the office of teaching, that, according to the practice of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the earliest ages of the Christian religion, and according to the united opinions of the fathers, and decrees of holy Councils,—they, in the first place, diligently instruct the faithful on the intercession and invocation of saints, the honour due to relics and lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints, reigning with Christ, offer up their prayers to God for men; that it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their supplications and assistance, in order to obtain favours from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour."¹

And again the Synod decrees,—

"That images of Christ, of the Blessed Virgin, and of other Saints, are to be exposed and retained particularly in churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be shewn to them; not as believing that any divinity or virtue is in them, for which they should be honoured; or that any thing is to be asked of them, or any trust placed in them, as the Gentiles once did in their idols; but because the honour given to pictures is referred to the Prototypes, which they represent, so that through the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our heads, and kneel, we may learn to adore Christ and to venerate his saints."²

Chemnitzius begins his examination of this part of the Decrees of the Council of Trent, by calling attention to the dishonest adroitness with which Papists disguise their real doctrines and

Rt. Rev. Dr Murdoch, R. C., Bp. in Glasgow."—See also Berington and Kirk, 454.

¹ Conc. Trid., Sess. xxv. *de invocat. S.S.*; quoted and translated by Berington and Kirk, 451.

² Ibid., from Berington and Kirk, 427.

practices, under an aspect less odious,¹ and of which certainly even the decrees just quoted present a sufficient striking example. But instead of entering into any discussion either of the statements or the arguments embodied in these decrees, let us turn to the exposition given of them in some of the most popular Popish books. And to begin with Mr Keenan.—"What if they call us idolaters," says this author, near the beginning of his Controversial Catechism. "Then," he replies,—

"as idolatry is a mortal offence to God, they must reconcile themselves to the awful thought, that the souls of the whole Christian world during fifteen hundred years are now in hell for their idolatries; for the whole Christian world during all that period was Catholic."²

This is idle, and nothing to the purpose; the argument is really much the same as if Mr Keenan had said, The religion of Rome is true Christianity, therefore it contains no idolatry,—or, The religion of Rome is true Christianity, therefore it is true Christianity.

Cardinal Wiseman is nowhere more eloquent than in repelling this charge, and his argument is about as good as Mr Keenan's, varied by a distinction to which the humbler priest does not advert, betwixt the guilt of an individual and the guilt of a multitude.

"Idolaters! know ye, my brethren, the import of this name? That it is the most frightful charge that can be laid to the score of any Christian? For throughout God's word the crime of idolatry is spoken of as the most heinous, the most odious, and the most detestable in his eyes, even in an individual; what then if committed in a mass, by millions of men?

"Then, gracious God! what must it be when flung as an accusation upon those who have been baptised in the name of Christ, who have tasted the sacred gift of his body, and received the Holy Ghost; and of whom, therefore, St Paul tells us, that it is impossible that they be renewed unto penance; for this is what St John calls a sin even unto death, for which men are not to pray."³

And so on.

¹ Chemnitz. Ex. Conc. Trid., 573. ² Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. i.

³ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 93.

Mr Keenan gives a chapter of his *Controversial Catechism* to Images, Relics, and Pilgrimages. It begins thus:—

“What is the use of images? They serve in the first place to adorn the church; secondly, to instruct the ignorant; and, thirdly, to excite devotion.—Do Catholics adore images? No; Catholics adore God only.—Do Catholics invoke images? No Catholic ever thought of such a thing; Catholics neither hope for, nor ask succour or grace from them.—What says the 25th session of the Council of Trent? That we honour pictures or images, not for any virtue these inanimate things possess, but on account of the originals which they represent. The honour is given to the original, not to the picture; so that, in uncovering the head or kneeling before a picture of Jesus Christ, we honour and adore Jesus Christ himself.”¹

To the substance and argument of all this we shall return presently, but in the first instance it seems proper to notice a very curious omission which Mr Keenan has made in copying from his original, Scheffmacher; for what has been above set down is taken from Scheffmacher, with some enlargement and fuller exhibition of the argument, and Mr Keenan immediately passes on to other arguments, some of which are not at all to be found in Scheffmacher. But why does he omit the remarkably interesting sentences which the continental Jesuit bestows upon one of the most important points in the whole controversy? The following questions and answers are from Scheffmacher, in the words of Bishop Coppinger’s translation:—

“Why then, and in what sense do Catholics say that there are miraculous images in some places? When they say so, they by no means believe that any inanimate creature can work miracles.—How then are miracles said to be wrought before some images, should that ever happen? God at times imparts particular graces to those who pray with extraordinary devotion before certain images.”²

Did Mr Keenan think that this would never do? Did he think that it would be better to say nothing at all on this part of the subject? Of course he did, for he has taken great care

¹ Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xvi., sect. 1.

² Scheffmacher, *Polem. Cat.*, Coppinger’s transl., pp. 134, 135. See Scheffmacher, *Cat. de Controv.*, ch. xx., sect. 3.

to say nothing about it. But was it very fair to lead his readers on by a few of the most plausible arguments which he could muster, without ever hinting at the existence of a most important argument on the opposite side, or undertaking to refute it? The Jesuit of last century was more open in his way of dealing with the subject. The representation which he makes is the same which is commonly made by Papists: the reader may judge for himself how far it is satisfactory. Perhaps Mr Keenan did not think it convenient in a controversial work to recall, if it could be avoided, any half forgotten stories about bleeding images, or walking images, or winking images, for which Protestant readers might by no means be well prepared. Or he might remember some such passage as the following of Bishop Stillingfleet:—

“If the people believe any divinity to be in the images, or put any trust or confidence in them, then the Council of Trent itself owns such to be like the heathen idolaters. Now, how shall it be known when the people believe divinity to be in images, but by some more than ordinary presence or operation in or by them? by their having a greater opinion of one image than of another of the same person? by their going long pilgrimages to certain images in hopes of relief, when they might easily cause images to represent them at home? And that such are no extravagant imaginations is known to all who have heard of Loretto, or Compostello, or other places nearer home.”¹

Cardinal Wiseman is also reserved and cautious on this subject of images, although one of his lectures is devoted to the “Invocation of Saints, their Relics and Images;” but he has not thought it possible or proper entirely to omit all notice of the familiar Protestant argument above presented; and so we find him saying,—

“If an ignorant man prays before any object, or goes by preference to any certain place, in consequence of an experience having produced conviction in his mind, no matter whether justly or not, that his prayers are

¹ Stillingfleet, *Doct. and Pract.*, ch. i.

more effectual there than elsewhere, certainly by acting on that feeling he commits no act of superstition; for he attributes all that special efficacy to the appointment of God, whereof he has become convinced."¹

The reason which satisfies Cardinal Wiseman that the man commits no act of superstition is rather the strongest evidence of gross superstition. But he proceeds,—

"In other religions the same idea may be found. Is it not common for a person to think that he can pray with more devotion in a certain part of his house, or in one oratory or chapel, rather than in another? And yet who says that such a one is superstitious?"²

This is almost as ridiculous as when afterwards, declaiming against the attempt to abridge his natural right of using whatever help he can towards the worship of God, he speaks of the *ringing of bells*, as if Protestants acknowledged it to be one of those things which "appertain to the worship of the Church."³

But returning to the commencement of Mr Keenan's chapter on Images, as already quoted, we find him telling us, after Scheffmacher, that "they serve in the first place to adorn the church; secondly, to instruct the ignorant; and thirdly, to excite devotion;" repudiating as with indignation the idea that members of the Romish Church adore or invoke images, and insisting upon the distinction laid down by the Council of Trent betwixt honour given to the image itself and honour given to the original whom it represents, by acts of reverence before it.

"Catholics place images and pictures in their churches," say Berington and Kirk in one of their *propositions*,

"to reduce their wandering thoughts and to enliven their memories towards heavenly things. They show, besides a *respect* to the representations of Christ, of the mysterious facts of their religion, and of the saints of God, beyond what is due to every profane figure; not that they believe any *virtue* to reside in them, for which they ought to be honoured, but because the honour given to the pictures is referred to the *prototype*, or the thing represented."⁴

¹ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 118.

² Ibid.

³ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 128.

⁴ Berington and Kirk, 411.

One would think these Popish controversialists were sadly ignorant of the writings of the most eminent theologians of their own Church—as of Bellarmine, who has a chapter to prove that true and proper worship is to be given to images, and of Suarez, who says it is an article of faith that worship is to be given to them. Whatever may be the precise meaning of the article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. which asserts that *due* honour and veneration is to be given to the images of Christ, of the Virgin, and of the Saints, it surely does mean that some measure of honour and veneration is due to them, or in other words, that they are set up to be honoured and venerated. But could the French or Swiss reader of Scheffmacher's catechism or the Scottish reader of Mr Keenan's, into whose hands it is put by a neighbour or an active insidious priest, ever guess, from what has been above quoted, that any such doctrine is held by the Church of Rome. "They serve in the first place to adorn the churches, secondly, to instruct the ignorant, and thirdly, to excite devotion!"

Afterwards, indeed, Mr Keenan asks—

"What says the 25th Session of the Council of Trent?" and answers—

"That we honour pictures or images, not for any virtue these inanimate things possess, but on account of the originals which they represent. The honour is given to the original, not to the picture; so that in uncovering the head, or kneeling before a picture of Jesus Christ, we honour and adore Jesus Christ himself."¹

But whilst he speaks of *honouring* them, he takes care not to speak of *venerating* them. Was it fair thus to avoid the stronger, and therefore more important word of the Council's decree? Is this to place the controversy on its right footing? Thus Popery shrinks from shewing its face to the light, and would creep in amongst us under a disguise. Moreover, Mr Keenan shews more adroitness than is commendable in bringing in the picture of Jesus Christ for illustration. What if it were a picture of St Alphonsus Liguori? To whom or to what are the honour and adoration then referred?

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. I.

To adorn the churches, to instruct the ignorant, and to excite devotion! How unlike the language of the second Council of Nice, which Papists acknowledge as a genuine œcumenical council, referring to it in their argument from antiquity,¹ and which decreed that the images of Christ and the saints are to be venerated and adored, though not with the *true latria* or worship exclusively due to God, and which thundered forth anathemas against all who should call this image worship *idolatry*, or refuse to honour images, or even hold fellowship with those who were so heretical! How unlike the language of the Council of Trent which confirms this decree of the second Council of Nice, and whilst it allows this inferior worship of images themselves, sets no bounds to the relative worship or honour that may be given them for the sake of their *originals*, and sanctions by its silence all the processions and consecrations by which they were exalted and glorified in the popular estimation.²

Here we may consider a remarkable distinction which is drawn betwixt practices *approved* of, and practices merely *tolerated* by the Church. It is analogous to another distinction, of which Papists try to avail themselves in this very argument, betwixt practices merely *approved* of, and practices *enjoined*. The use of images, they tell us, is *approved* of by the Council of Trent, but not *enjoined*. It is a matter of discipline.³ It is unnecessary to expend words in shewing that this really does not alter the matter, in respect of the idolatry chargeable upon the Church; and when our attention is called to it, it seems very much as if dust were purposely thrown in our eyes. Nor can the Church escape condemnation for practices which she tolerates, having perfect power to put them down, although she withholds her formal approbation. But the subject is interesting, although of no argumentative value, unless it be in another way than Popish writers seem to imagine, as indicating an apprehension of some-

¹ See Perrone, I., 1224.

² See Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., chap. i.

³ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 129. Perrone, Prælect. Theol., I., 1217.

thing not easily to be vindicated. The reader will be curious to know what practices the Church *merely tolerates*. Mr Keenan informs us,—

“Certain practices, introduced in some places, which are not perfectly conformable to the spirit of the Church, and are founded on grosser and less enlightened ideas of piety and religion, yet which are not opposed in themselves either to faith or good morals, such as, for example, dressing out images of saints at the corners of the street, burning torches before them, &c. The Church neither commands nor condemns these, unless she has reason to believe that the people are in danger of being led by such practices into superstition, in which case the bishop is charged to prohibit them.”¹

There must then be some difference, which Mr Keenan does not explain to us, betwixt dressing out images of saints at the corners of streets and dressing them out in churches; also betwixt burning torches before saints and burning them before the viaticum, with which practice, as we have already seen, indulgences are connected, and which is thus on high authority recommended to all expectants of purgatory even in our own country.² But Mr Keenan's views of the practices merely tolerated, must surely be a little different from Cardinal Wiseman's, who defends, upon the ground of a harmless or even laudable enthusiasm, what we of this country are not accustomed to see, and are apt to think superstitious.

“If we go into other countries, we find demonstrations of outward feeling, even of a much warmer and more enthusiastic character than here, and, consequently, nothing is more common than to condemn these exhibitions, by comparison with what occurs in colder countries and among more phlegmatic characters, as superstitious and idolatrous. But they who are acquainted with the people, and who have been instructed concerning their belief, know, that however extravagant they may outwardly appear, inwardly their faith and conviction are perfectly safe, and in accordance with that laid down as the belief of the Church.”³

So that we are not fair judges, according to Cardinal Wiseman,

¹ Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 244.

² See p. 184.

³ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 131.

of what is or what is not idolatrous. A warm and enthusiastic temperament will account sufficiently for the horrible adoration of the Bambino at Rome, or for the worshippers in a Brazilian church bowing before a doll of a foot and a half in height, elegantly dressed with a gold chain and a small toy watch.¹ This amiable enthusiasm will account for anything, and prove the inward faith and conviction to be safe. Thus it is that Cardinal Wiseman essays to deal with our understandings.

But really it seems ridiculous, when instead of a discussion of the greatest points of the whole controversy respecting images, which we are entitled to look for in a professedly controversial work, we are gravely told that in the first place they are of use to adorn the Church. It is a mere impertinence, or a trick to draw away attention from the actual questions at issue.

As for their use in instructing the ignorant, Scheffmacher and Mr Keenan do not tell us how they serve this purpose. The Council of Trent expressed itself more fully in its own decree. But it confined itself to assertion. And the assumption is most gratuitous, that men can be instructed by such means, to say nothing of the inconsistency of such a pretence, put forward by a Church, which neglects the ordinary means, and wherever it has the whole field to itself, leaves the multitude of its members in extremest ignorance. What instruction or confirmation in any article of faith, are men likely to derive from the sight of a picture, painted like many of the Popish pictures, by some very ignorant artist, or the representation of some saint of whose appearance, except it were by a miracle, the artist could know nothing; to whom perhaps, as is alleged to be very commonly the case, he gave the features of his own mistress? What instruction can the Parisians derive from that picture of Queen Victoria, which occupies or lately occupied the place, and was consecrated under the name of a saint in one of their stateliest edifices? What instruction did the spectators derive from the figure of St Giles, which was borne about in annual procession through the Streets of Edinburgh, or from those images of male

¹ See Gardner's Travels in the Interior of Brazil, 213.

and female saints with different attendant animals, which were the subject of Sir David Lyndsay's satire, and which were wont to be exhibited to our Scottish forefathers before the Reformation? And if men are in so much danger, as Rome pretends, of mistaking the instructions of the Bible, is there no danger of their mistaking those which the images are intended to convey? How is that so dangerous, and this so safe?

Something more plausible might be said in favour of the use of pictures or images, to recall to remembrance things already known, or even to stimulate devotion. But what of all plausibilities, what of all human arguments, if opposed to the word of God! Nor will those who seriously inquire fail at last to find evidence of the divine wisdom in the prohibition of what even good men might otherwise have resorted to with the most pious intention, and of tendencies in human nature, tendencies not peculiar to the Jews,—although very strikingly manifested by them at the base of Mount Sinai, and throughout many centuries of their history,—which render all such adjuncts and stimulants to devotion exceedingly perilous.

But here the subject may be viewed in two different lights,—with reference to an express prohibition in the law of God, which Papists in vain endeavour to explain away, and with reference to the absence of any positive ordinance of God. For even if there were no express prohibition, yet might we fairly assume that God will not accept any worship but such as he himself has appointed. He reveals himself to us as the object of our worship; and had he not revealed himself, we never could have known him. He reveals to us also the manner of his worship, and how could we otherwise have known how to worship him? What presumption for man to add anything to God's own ordinances of his own worship, or to invent any methods of approaching him, who himself has in his wondrous condescension taught us, saying, "Take with you words, and turn unto the Lord; say unto him, take away all iniquity, &c.!"¹ So then, even if there were no express prohibition of images, yet on the

¹ Hos. xiv. 2.

ground of this obvious principle, in the absence of any positive ordinance, we would be warranted in refusing to employ them even as helps in the worship of God,—which it must all the while be remembered is not their sole use in the Church of Rome, for they themselves are venerated.

Cardinal Wiseman defends the practice of his Church on the ground that it is nowhere forbidden in the word of God, and asks what authority there is to deprive him of such objects as Catholics are accustomed to pray before, and to esteem “as inspiring faith and devotion.” He holds it his *natural right* to use anything towards promoting the worship of God, which is not in any way forbidden. But this is sophistically to slip aside from the real question, which is not about the means of promoting the worship of God, but about the very manner of worship, and to a certain extent at least, about the object of worship.

“If I find,” he says, “that any picture or representation of our Saviour, or of his blessed mother, or of his saints, acts more intimately on my affections, and excites warmer feelings of devotion, I am justified, and I act well, in endeavouring so to excite them. It is precisely the same motive as that for going to one place of worship rather than another, because in it I find my feelings more easily drawn to God.”¹

But what if this excitement of devotional feelings be accompanied with a misdirection of them? The popish divine speaks of the excitement of devotion,—but although he frames his argument as if he used that term in the very same sense that Protestants would, yet we cannot understand and appreciate it, if we suppose that this devotion has no other object than God.

¹ Wiseman, Lect. on Principal Doctrines, II., 129.—The last sentence suggests a quotation from *Geraldine*. “Yes! our ancestors were a serious thoughtful race of men! The habits of their minds were religious, however they might sometimes deviate in their acts. They loved to see the dim religious light through the devotional glow of painted glass. Ah! how unlike the stare and glare of our modern chapels!” (*Geraldine*, I., 249). Again, in a Popish chapel, and out of mere regard to it and its furniture. “‘Oh!’ cried Geraldine, sinking on her knees before the front of the tribune, ‘how beautiful, how holy! Everything breathes of God!’” (*Ibid.*, II., 245).

Papists evidently feel that this subject of images requires a peculiarly cautious treatment in Protestant countries, although Cardinal Wiseman has in this as in other things, considerably over-stepped the bounds of that caution which previous dignitaries and apologists of his Church in this country seem to have prescribed to themselves. Even in Ireland, the Most Rev. Dr James Butler’s Catechism does not present this part of Popery in its grossest form, nor so strongly as it is presented in the decree of the Council of Trent, and the creed of Pope Pius IV. We are told that “Catholics kneel before the images of Christ and his saints, to honour Christ and his saints whom their images represent,”—where, however, it may be remarked in passing, that Christ and his saints seem to be put pretty much upon a level. It is then asked—

“Is it proper to shew any mark of respect to the crucifix, and the pictures of Christ and his saints?”

and answered—

“Yes; because they relate to Christ and his saints, being representations and memorials of them.”¹

But a mere *mark of respect* seems a poor substitute for *due honour and veneration*.

Dr Milner asserts more plainly than either Mr Keenan or Dr James Butler, the relative or secondary veneration to which images become entitled; but yet he declares that “it is a point agreed upon among Catholic doctors and divines, that the memorials of religion form no essential part of it,” and therefore he would not insist upon the use of them.² He concludes in a strain calculated to impose upon such as take his argument on trust; with an affectation of profound humility, which none of his successors have excelled.

¹ Most Rev. Dr James Butler’s Cat., Lesson xvi.

² Milner, End of Controv., Letters xxxiv, xxxv.—“Hence, if you should become a Catholic, as I pray God you may, I shall never ask you if you have a pious picture, or relic, or so much as a crucifix in your possession.” (Letter xxxiv.) Liberal indeed! but would he be thought a good “Catholic,” who should refuse to have?

"Your faith and devotion may not stand in need of such memorials; but mine alas! do. I am too apt to forget what my Saviour has done and suffered for me; but the sight of his representation often brings this to my memory, and affects my best sentiments. Hence, I would rather part with most of the books in my library, than with the figure of my crucified Lord."¹

But let us pause for a moment, and ere we proceed further, let us turn from Popish to Protestant theology,—from Popish to Protestant piety,—from Dr Milner's *End of Controversy*, to Dr John Owen's *Declaration of the Glorious Mystery of the person of Christ*. The following passage is so admirable in itself, and so much to the present purpose, that I know not what to do but to avail myself of it.

"Many there are, who, not comprehending, not being affected with, that divine, spiritual description of the person of Christ which is given us by the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, do feign unto themselves false representations of him by images and pictures, so as to excite carnal and corrupt affections in their minds. By the help of their outward senses they reflect on their imaginations the shape of a human body, cast into postures and circumstances dolorous or triumphant; and so, by the working of their fancy, raise a commotion of mind in themselves, which they suppose to be love unto Christ. But all these idols are teachers of lies. The true beauty and amiableness of the person of Christ, which is the formal object and cause of divine law, is so far from being represented herein, as that the mind is thereby wholly diverted from the contemplation of it. For no more can be so pictured unto us but what may belong unto a mere man, and what is arbitrarily referred unto Christ, not by faith, but by corrupt imagination.—The *beauty of the person of Christ*, as represented in the Scripture, consists in things invisible unto the eyes of flesh. They are such as no hand of man can represent or shadow. It is the eye of faith alone that can see this King in his beauty. What else can contemplate on the uncreated glories of his divine nature? Can the hand of man represent the union

¹ Milner, *End of Controv.*, Letter xxxiv.

of his natures in the same person, wherein he is peculiarly amiable? What eye can discern the mutual communication of the properties of his different natures in the same person, which depends thereon, whence it is that God laid down his life for us, and purchased his Church with his own blood? In these things, O vain man! doth the loveliness of the person of Christ unto the souls of believers consist, and not in those strokes of art which fancy hath guided a skilful hand and pencil unto. And what eye of flesh can discern the inhabitation of the Spirit in all fullness in the human nature? Can his condescension, his love, his grace, his power, his compassion, his offices, his fitness, and ability to save sinners, be deciphered on a tablet, or engraven on wood or stone? However such pictures may be adorned, however beautified and enriched, they are not that Christ which the soul of the spouse doth love:—they are not any means of representing his love unto us, or of conveying our love unto him:—they only divert the minds of superstitious persons from the Son of God, unto the embraces of a cloud, composed of fancy and imagination."¹

I prefer quoting these sentences from Owen to attempting any remarks of my own on Dr Milner's specious utterance of spurious piety respecting the crucifix.

Dr Milner makes much ado about the errors of the earlier English translations of the Bible, which had the words *images* and the *worshipping of images* in some places where now we read *idols* and *idolatry*, alleging this to have been a wilful corruption, intended to support an "impious fraud." He refers to the texts regarding covetousness, Col. iii., 5, and Eph. v., 5, where, instead of "covetousness which is idolatry," as in our present version, or "covetousness which is the service of idols," as in the Popish version, some of the old English Bibles read, "covetousness which is the worshipping of images," and instead of "an idolater," "a worshipper of images." Yet it might have seemed

¹ Owen on the Person of Christ, ch. xiii. (Works, new edition, I., 159, 160.)

hard to found such a charge upon such a translation, which is only too verbally exact, and errs in fixing the mind too closely to the outward action, instead of allowing it to contemplate the state of heart, which, though it always accompanies that outward action, may also, as in the covetous man, exist apart from it. In like manner, as evident instances of the wilful corruption of the ancient Protestant translations, Dr Milner brings forward the words, "How agrees the temple of God with images?" and "Babes, keep yourselves from images," occurring in the places where we now read, "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" and "Little children, keep yourselves from idols."¹

This argument of his, if argument it may be called, which has only a remote and indirect connection with the matter in hand, is an old one. It was used by Gregory Martin, "one of the Readers of Divinity in the English College of Rheims," in the end of the sixteenth century, but with a better shew of reason, as his work had for its professed object a "discovery of the manifold corruptions" of the heretical translations. Dr Fulke, in his reply to Martin, quotes Popish authorities which countenance the translation in question.² But perhaps it is more to the purpose to state that even before Martin wrote, some of the English versions exhibited the other, and certainly better, translation which now prevails. And we need not hesitate to admit that even Popish objections, though unfairly urged, may have led, at least in minute particulars, to valuable criticism and real improvements of the Protestant versions. Yet, however we may justly deem our present translation to be an improvement, we must also remember the change which the language has undergone since the middle or the earlier part of the sixteenth century, and that words now naturalized and familiar were then mere exotics in the language, and, like many of the expressions used in the present Popish translation of the

¹ 2 Cor. vi., 16, and John v., 21.

² See Fulke's Defence of Translations of the Bible, (Parker Society's Edition,) pp. 100-106 and 179-216.

Bible, might have served the purpose of obscuring the sense. So that, in reference to his own time or the time when these versions were published, we may still, in some measure, perceive the force and justice of Fulke's reply to his adversary's question concerning "the next, and readiest, and most proper English of *idolum*, *idololatra*, and *idololatria*." "If you ask for the readiest and most proper English of these words, I must needs answer you, 'an image, a worshipper of images, and worshipping of images' as we have sometimes translated. The other that you would have, 'idol, idolater, and idolatry,' be rather Greekish than English words; which, though they be used of many Englishmen, yet are they not understood of all as the other be."¹

But, at all events, what is really wanted is not an argument upon a point remotely connected with the question, but a direct argument in favour of the Popish doctrine and practice. And Dr Milner proceeds to present one, which must be given in his own words.

"Dr Porteous² is very positive that there is no Scriptural warrant for retaining and venerating these exterior memorials; and he maintains that no other memorial ought to be admitted than the Lord's Supper. Does he remember the ark of the covenant, made by the command of God, together with the punishment of those who profaned it, and the blessings bestowed on those who revered it? And what was the ark of the covenant after all? A chest of settim wood, containing the tables of the law and two golden pots of manna; the whole being covered with two carved images of cherubim; in short, it was a memorial of God's mercy and bounty to his people. 'But,' says the Bishop, 'the Roman Catholics make images of Christ and of his saints after their own fancy; before these images, and even that of the cross, they kneel down and prostrate themselves; to these they lift up their eyes, and in that posture they pray.' Supposing all this to be true, has the Bishop never read that, when the Israelites were smitten at Ai, *Joshua fell to the earth upon his face before the ark of the Lord, until the even tide, he and the elders of Israel, and Joshua said, alas, O Lord God,*" &c.³

As this is a great Popish controversialist's great argument

¹ Fulke's Defence, (Parker Society,) p. 179.

² The Bishop of London.

³ Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxiv.

upon this important subject, it certainly deserves a little consideration. But what an argument it is! What an exhibition of ignorance on points which not only a very imperfect theologian but a Sabbath-school boy or girl might be expected to understand! It is substantially, however, the same argument which may be found in almost all the Popish books.

Let the reader observe that there is not here the slightest hint of any typical purpose served by the ark or by the mercy seat which covered it, or of any peculiar connection of it with the manifestation of the divine presence, or with the covenant by which Jehovah was Israel's God, and Israel was Jehovah's people. Nay, all this is expressly denied, unless there be some Jesuitical subterfuge for explanation of the words, "In short, it was a memorial of God's mercy and bounty to his people." Yet we read in Exod. xxv. 22, that when the Lord commanded Moses concerning the making of the ark, he concluded with these words, "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Such promises were frequently repeated. "I will appear in the cloud above the mercy seat,"¹ said the Lord; and he is described as dwelling between the cherubim.² We can understand then why the children of Israel worshipped with their faces towards the holy place and the ark of the covenant, or toward the temple which contained it, or toward Jerusalem which contained the temple,—why Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the temple made so frequent mention of this as a requisite condition of true and acceptable prayer,³—why Daniel in exile prayed with his windows open in his chamber towards Jerusalem.⁴ Even as sacrifice was offered to typify that one sacrifice which alone could expiate sin or reconcile man to God,—even as the high priest entered into the holiest of all once every year to typify Christ's entrance into the holy place not

made with hands, and intercession there,—so, by the like divine appointment, did the Jewish worshipper turn towards the symbol of the covenant and of reconciliation and of God's presence, with typical reference to Jesus Christ, and in order to express trust in him. But with the other "*shadows*" this has passed away.

How strange that of all this a great Popish controversialist should seem to know nothing! Might he not have been better employed sometimes in looking into his Bible, instead of looking at his crucifix?

But when Papists tell us of the ark of the covenant and its cherubim of glory, and endeavour to deduce from them an argument for the veneration of images and relics, or, as they call them, *religious memorials*, we may fairly demand of them whether they have also a Shechinah, and ask for the promise of God's presence and of his meeting with his people as of old, when he appeared in the cloud upon the mercy seat, and spake from between the cherubim. For without this, to what purpose is their argument?—which indeed they frame only by suppressing much of what relates to the ark and to the cherubim, omitting the things which are most important.

"Had man raised two images of cherubim on the ark of the covenant," (says Cardinal Wiseman, putting this question more nearly on its right footing than it is usual with him to do,)

"and bowed down before them and worshipped them, and asked that in them God would hear his prayers, it would have been gross superstition, and there would have been even danger of falling into idolatry, as in the worship of the golden calf. But the moment God directed these to be raised, and called them his mercy seat, and said that from it he would hear the prayers of his servants, and before it the high priest was ordered to bring his gifts, that instant it became a means appointed by God, and there was no superstition in placing a trust in its instrumentality."¹

I hope Cardinal Wiseman admits, although it does not quite appear, that there would still have been superstition in worship-

¹ Lev. xvi. 2. ² Ps. lxxx. 1. ³ 1 Kings viii. ⁴ Dan. vi. 10.

¹ Wiseman, Lect. on Principal Doct., II., 117, 118.

ping the cherubim, and that he does not mean us to take for granted that the Jews were enjoined or even accustomed to do so. But although his argumentative reference to the ark and the cherubim has more speciousness of plausibility, so far as it goes, than Dr Milner's, it is liable to the same radical objections, and founded upon the same erroneous view of the Jewish ordinance. But what Popish theologians believe regarding the ark, we may further learn from Mr Keenan—

“Has God himself honoured relics and through them wrought astonishing miracles?”—“See also 1 Kings, (*alias* Sam.) v., and also Sam. vi. 19, as to the wonders God was pleased to perform on account of THE ARK, WHICH WAS CERTAINLY A MERE RELIC.”¹

Mr Keenan introduces the argument from the cherubim in a style which perhaps deserves to be exhibited as well as the argument.

“If the Scripture condemned as idolatry, the making or use of pictures or images, would not the Scripture contradict itself?”

“Yes; *for in that case God himself would contradict his own command;*”² and in fact order that idolatry which in the commandment he had forbid, Exod. xxv. 18, ‘God said to Moses, Thou shalt make also *two cherubims of beaten gold* on the two sides of the oracle; let one cherub be on one side, and the other on the other.’ See also 20, 21, 22 verses of same chapter.”³

Can Papists indeed calmly venture to compare such things as the Bambino or the “*wee St Giles*,”—some day, perhaps, yet to be discovered again about the precincts of Edinburgh,—with the “cherubim of glory” which shadowed the mercy seat? Or can Protestants hear it done without mingled pity and indignation?

But there is one point upon which more than any other this controversy really turns:—Does this worship of images proceed upon God's command? Nor will God's express command of one thing warrant men's invention of as many similar things as they please, for this were to assume that God in legislating for us has set us an example that we might legislate also. Surely he has not given ordinances to his Church that men might add

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. 2.

² The italics are not Mr Keenan's.

³ Keenan, Controv. Cat., chap. xvi., sect. 1.

to them on pretence of similarity, but that men might observe them, acknowledging his infinite wisdom, and receiving them as neither too many nor too few.

As for the arguments which Dr Milner and Dr Wiseman derive from certain practices of the Church of England,—kneeling at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, bowing at the name of Jesus, retaining of pictures in certain churches, and so on,—they have evidently no real value in relation to the subject in hand, and need not therefore be further considered. In the pretext which they afford to Papists, we may see a serious objection to such things, and an illustration of their real nature. An Episcopalian might perhaps find it easier to refute the argument derived from them than to defend the practices themselves, or shew that they are free from all taint of superstition.

A favourite Popish argument is from the practice of the early Church; but that images, crosses, and relics had begun to prevail in the third and fourth centuries, will as readily prove the growth of corruption as the lawfulness of their use; and when Dr Milner gravely quotes Eusebius, “the father of Church History, and the friend of Constantine,” as saying that “he himself had seen a miraculous image of our Saviour in brass, which had been erected by the woman who touched the hem of his garment,”¹ he seems to forget his usual anxiety to avoid the ridiculous. Dr Wiseman prudently leaves this story untold. In his *Lectures* he does not indulge in such stories; but he makes amends in the *Lives of the Saints*,—intended probably for more advanced readers.

“To be brief,” says Dr Milner, “the words, *Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven thing*, are either a prohibition of all images, and of course of those round the Bishop's own cathedral St Paul's, and upon all existing coins, which I am sure he will not consent to; or else, it is a mere prohibition of images made to receive divine worship, in which we perfectly agree with him.”² It is curious how fond Popish writers are of this

¹ Milner, End of Controv., Letter xxxv.

² Ibid., Letter xxxiv.

ridiculous reference to existing coins. "If all likenesses were forbid by this commandment," says Bishop Challoner, "we should be obliged to fling down our sign-posts, and deface the king's coin."¹ In another of his works, the same dignitary puts forward this same argument from the king's coin in a somewhat different connection from that of the sign-posts. "And that God does not absolutely forbid the making of the likeness of anything, is not only the general belief of all Christians, who carry about with them without scruple the likeness of their kings in the current coin of their respective countries, but is visible from Scripture, wherein God commanded the making of two cherubim of beaten gold, to be placed over the ark of the covenant in the very sanctuary, and in like manner commanded the making of the brazen serpent, for the healing of those who were bit by the fiery serpents, which serpent was an emblem of Christ."²

The reference to the Brazen Serpent, though not made by Bishop Challoner only, but by many Popish writers, is peculiarly unfortunate, as we read in 2 Kings, xviii., 4, that Hezekiah "brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made, for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it: and he called it Nehushtan," that is, *a piece of brass*. Keenan refers with all confidence to the brazen serpent, but he makes no reference to this conclusion of its history.³ It would be hard for him or any Papist to shew that the Jews ever bestowed a greater veneration upon it than Papists do upon their images, the outward sign expressive of that veneration being the same. Cardinal Wiseman's willingness that we should look into his heart will not strengthen his argument very much, however ostentatiously professed. "If in our power, we would open our breasts, and ask them to look even into our hearts, for God knows that we have nothing to conceal,—and there let them read our belief,

¹ Challoner, *Grounds of Catholic Doctrine*, chap. 9.

² Challoner, *Catholic Christian Instructed*, chap. 27.

³ See Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xvi., sect. 1. "Did God ever use an image for miraculous purposes?—Yes; in Numbers xxi. 8," &c.

as written on its tablets in the simplest and plainest terms."¹ We cannot look in.

One of the idols most in use amongst Papists is the crucifix, or image of Christ upon the cross, which is made of various sizes and materials, generally of wood or metal, sometimes as large as life, and sometimes small and portable. Crucifixes "in great variety" are advertised for sale by Popish booksellers even in this country, along with "coloured prints, illuminated prayers, altar cards, rosary rings, beads," and other similar goods. We have seen how devoted an attachment to his crucifix, even Dr Milner was not ashamed to avow. Dr Wiseman's estimation of the same piece of furniture, and his reasons for it, may be inferred from the following story, presented by him to the British public, in the *Life of St Francis di Girolamo, S. J.*, [*i.e.*, the Jesuit.]

"Once he [St Francis] preached near a house of ill-fame, out of which in the midst of his discourse, a carriage prepared to drive; whereupon the persons in it were requested to wait a few moments, and not interrupt the servant of God; but they contemptuously cried out to the coachman to drive on. 'Blessed Jesus!' exclaimed the saint, holding the crucifix before the horses, since these goddesses have no respect for Thee, the brute beasts at least shall do Thee homage.' And in very deed the animals sank down on their knees, and would not stir till the discourse was over."²

¹ Wiseman, *Lectures on Principal Doctrines*, II., 132.

² *Lives of Saints* of 26th May 1839, p. 80. This story is immediately followed by another, which, though it has nothing to do with the part of the subject now under our consideration, is yet so illustrative of the intellectual degradation upon which the volume reckons, and which it is calculated to promote, that I cannot forbear quoting it. "On another occasion, when our saint, though he strove ever so, could not succeed in gathering around him an audience,—'In sooth,' said he, 'what fruit do I reap in Naples by preaching? I spend my breath here to little purpose, whereas were I to preach in the forest, the very lions and bears would crouch down and listen.' At this moment a dog passing, stopped whilst the saint was speaking. 'There, said he, that dumb animal has more sensibility than thousands of sinners.' Which circumstance so struck a woman who happened to witness it, that she conceived a lively sorrow for her sins, and repaired her

But more offensive than even the representation of Christ upon the cross, is the representation of Christ glorified in heaven. After perusing the description of the glorified Redeemer in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, or in the first chapter of Revelation, what can we think of the irreverent folly of the man who makes that glorious being a subject for his pencil? But representations of this kind are common amongst Papists. They are to be seen in the little pictures upon some of the scapulars, and in many other pictures which exhibit the glorified Virgin in heaven with the infant Jesus in her arms. One, somewhat different, forms the frontispiece to a little book called "The Glory of Mary," by James Augustine Stothert, lately published in London. Christ is represented in heaven, for the stars are all around in the corners of the picture, and clouds seem to form his seat, and with him sits Mary, her head leaning upon his shoulder, her hand locked in his hand. Of the idolatry which makes Mary its goddess, awful things remain to be exhibited; at present, I refer to this picture only as shewing how Papists even in this country, as well as in Italy, attempt representations which can only debase and materialize their conceptions of what is in itself so exalted and spiritual that it transcends all human conception and thought. "When I saw him I fell at his feet as dead," says the Apostle John.¹ But a Popish artist supposes that he can represent this glory, and a Popish "Missionary Apostolic,"—once, alas! a Protestant, but now how changed!—makes the monstrous production a frontispiece of his book. This is the Popery now at work in Edinburgh. This is a book and this a picture in which it provides attraction for the upper classes of society in Britain.

Still worse, if possible, are the representations of the persons of the Godhead, which, as is well known, have often formed Popish altar-pieces, and have been so exhibited to receive the homage of the faithful. The very mystery of the Trinity is not

past misconduct by a virtuous life."—Miraculous circumstances of this kind must be of frequent occurrence, one would think, in most towns.

¹ Rev. i. 17.

sacred from irreverent touch. Some of these Popish altar-pieces may be seen in this country, in collections of paintings, in fit company with lascivious productions which no love of art can justify a Christian people in retaining and exposing.

Some Papists seem sensible that these representations of the Godhead are not easily to be defended. They exhibit, however, their usual ingenuity in drawing distinctions. God is not to be painted as in himself or in his own nature; but any of the divine persons may be painted under the symbolical forms under which at any time he has appeared. And there is no danger, they say, if the people be only rightly instructed!¹ Dr Milner takes a somewhat different course in respect to this subject. "Certain painters," he admits, "have represented God the Father under the image of a venerable old man, as, in fact, he was pleased to appear so to some of the prophets, Isa. vi. 1; Dan. vii. 9; but the Council of Trent says nothing concerning that representation."² We have another strange illustration of Popish learning and interpretation of Scripture in this citation of Isa. vi. 1; a verse which so certainly relates to Christ, the passage being referred to in John xii. 41, "These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him." But the statement which would attribute these pictorial representations of God the Father to the mere fancy or judgment of *certain painters*, contains no small amount of deliberate falsehood. Dr Milner can have been no stranger to the fact that the proposition was *condemned* by Pope Alexander VIII., "*Dei Patris sedentis simulacrum nefas est Christiano in templo collocare* [It is wrong to place in a Christian temple an image of God the Father in a sitting posture"], and that a similar proposition was condemned by Pius VI.³ Moreover, we may ask, would these representations have been allowed as altar-pieces if they had not been approved by others besides the painters? It is strange, how, at every turn in the Popish controversy, we meet with falsehoods, or with odious attempts to colour and disguise the

¹ Perrone, Praelect. Theol., I., 1230.

² Milner, End of Controv., Letter xxxiv.

³ Perrone, *ut supra*.

truth. Compare Dr Milner's statement, just quoted, with the following passage from Vasari, concerning Benvenuto Cellini, the celebrated artist:—

At Rome, he made for Pope Clement VII. a button to be worn upon his pontifical habit, fixing a diamond to it, with the most exquisite art, round which were certain figures of children, represented on plates of gold, and a figure of God the Father, admirably engraved. Besides being paid for his labours, he was, BY THE POPE, invested with the office of mace-bearer.¹

And, to conclude, let us only further compare Dr Milner with Cardinal Wiseman, as the Cardinal's views are incidentally exhibited in the Lives of the Saints, already so often quoted.

"Before she [St Veronica Giuliani] was six months old, seeing a picture representing the Most Blessed Trinity, in whose honour that day was dedicated (12th June, 1661), she left her mother's arms of her own accord, and without any assistance whatever, walked to it, and with many signs of reverence, remained as if enchanted before it."²

What an exhibition of religion to an infidel age! Yet there are human beings in Scotland, actually no longer wearing baby clothes, who can receive with demonstrations of reverence the man who makes this exhibition, and who crams them with this abominable nonsense!—However, it is clear at all events that the Cardinal approves of pictures of the Trinity.

The conduct of the Church of Rome with regard to the Second Commandment, exhibits not only great dishonesty and audacity, but betrays a secret sense of the irreconcilable opposition betwixt her practice and that commandment. Retained in her Bibles, it has been left out of her catechisms, or has been given in an abridged and mutilated form.

The omission of the second commandment from Popish books of instruction seems to have been both general and complete until the light of the Reformation began to shine, after which it would have been manifestly imprudent in some parts of the

¹ Extract from Vasari, in Supplement to Memoirs of Benvenuto Cellini, Rescoe's Translation.

² Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 225.

world to have persevered in so gross a trick, and Popery accommodated itself to circumstances. The Second Commandment began to be sometimes given, though indeed always as a part of the First,—as in the "Catechism or Short Instruction" of Father Peter Canisius, Doctor in Theology, which was highly esteemed and widely circulated amongst the Papists of the sixteenth century, and of which the Scottish translation gives the "First Commandment" in these words "Thou sal haiv no unkouth gods befor me: thou sal nocht mak to thyself ony graven idol to adore it."¹ Similar to this is the form of the "First Commandment" in the Montpellier Catechism, although it is no book of elementary instruction, but an elaborate work in three volumes.² Mr Keenan, however, in his Catechism of the Christian Religion, "being, with some small changes," as its title page informs us, "a compendium of the Catechism of Montpellier," has seen it to be proper to give the two commandments in full, although he binds them together in one, as the "First Commandment of God."³ The different versions of the Douay Catechism also, as M'Gavin tells us, vary in this respect; that used in Glasgow [1818] giving the Second Commandment at full length, and that used in the Highlands presenting it under the remarkable form of an *et cetera* appended to the First. "The First Commandment is, I am the Lord thy God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, and out of the house of bondage, thou shalt have no strange gods before me, &c."—a mode of using the *et cetera* which was probably first introduced in the "*Catechismus ad Parochos* founded upon the decrees of the Council of Trent, "*Non habebis deos alienos coram me, non facies tibi sculptile, &c.*"⁴

The commandments are thus given in the Most Reverend Dr James Butler's Catechism, as at present circulated; and it will be borne in mind that the omission in this case has the general sanction of the Popish prelates of Ireland.

¹ Quoted by M'Gavin, Protestant, No. xvii.

² Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., I., 211.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Protestant, *ut supra*.

"1. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt not have strange gods before me.

"2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

"3. Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day.

"4. Honour thy father and mother.

"5. Thou shalt not kill.

"6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

"7. Thou shalt not steal.

"8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

"9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.

"10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods."

And then immediately follows the question—

"Is it necessary to keep all, and every one of the ten commandments?

"Yes; the Scripture says, '*Whosoever shall offend in one is become guilty of all*;' that is, the observance of the other commandments will not avail him to salvation." James ii. 10.¹

How strangely do these words sound after such an important omission! How desperate does the audacity appear which could make such an omission and immediately quote such a declaration of Scripture!

It is strange also how studious of abridgment these Popish doctors appear when they come to the teaching of the commandments of God. God gave his commandments from Mount Sinai, summing up in them the whole moral law, speaking with his own voice in the hearing of affrighted Israel, amidst thundings and lightnings, and the noise of the trumpet, and the mountain smoking, and did not employ as afterwards the mediation of Moses;—God wrote the ten commandments with his own finger on the tables of stone;—but the thought of Sinai's terrors makes no impression upon Popish doctors, and what God has written they can undertake to improve. The words of the commandments were not many altogether, but these learned divines see how they can be made fewer with advantage, and unconscious of the insult to Divine Majesty and Wisdom, they proceed to abridge and mutilate them at their pleasure.

In Lingard's "Catechetical Instructions on the Doctrines

¹ Butler's Catechism, Lesson xiv.

and Worship of the Catholic Church," evidently intended for a higher and more educated class of minds than the Most Reverend Dr James Butler's Catechism, we find the commandments more fully exhibited, though there is evidence still of the Popish propensity to mutilate them. The First and Second Commandments are combined, according to the universal Popish arrangement, into one called the First Commandment, all the preceptive words of the Second Commandment being given,¹ but not the "reason annexed," which is given afterwards, in answer to another question,—the separation of it from the preceptive part being, however, an extraordinary thing in itself, and calculated greatly to weaken the force of the prohibition.² Dr Lingard, in uniting the First and Second Commandments into one, is of course compelled, according to the fashion of his Church, to make up the number by dividing the Tenth into two, which he excuses rather than justifies in a note, by a quotation from Bishop Bonner, of whom we may therefore infer that "the English Catholics of the present day" have not yet learned to be ashamed—the excuse being, that neither the words nor the sense are altered by the adoption of this rather than the other arrangement, but the "good considerations" which have determined it being left to the reader's conjecture.

It is curious to observe how, when Dr Lingard comes to what he calls the Ninth and Tenth commandments, he virtually combines them into one. Does not this of itself shew how indefensible and preposterous is the Popish arrangement?

"What is the Ninth Commandment?

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife.

"What is the Tenth Commandment?

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods."

The Douay Catechism conjoins them even more closely:—

"Say the Ninth and Tenth.

¹ The Papists all prefer the word *adore*, however, to *bow down*, "Thou shalt not bow down"—although the latter is the more correct translation.

² Lingard, Catech. Instr., 57, &c.

"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods."

And neither the Douay divines nor Dr Lingard give the words of the commandment more fully or correctly.—Dr Lingard then goes on, "In what are these two commandments different from the others?" nor under the head of the Ninth Commandment has he a single word of remark or exposition till he has added the Tenth.² How extraordinary that in the book of Exodus, in the Mosaic record of the words spoken by the Lord himself from Sinai, the order is such as to mix up with one another and confuse these two commandments, as the Papists will have them to be. Taking the words from the Popish version of the Bible, they stand thus:—"Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house: neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour's wife, nor his servant, nor his handmaid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his."³ The subtlety of all the Jesuits upon earth has never been able to invent a plausible reason for taking out the words which relate to a neighbour's wife, and making a separate commandment of them—taking a commandment out of the midst of a commandment. It is true that in the fifth chapter of the book of Deuteronomy, we find Moses, in his recapitulation of the commandments, inverting the order of these two clauses, and putting the prohibition with regard to a neighbour's wife before the other with regard to a neighbour's house; but it has been well remarked that this very transposition, seeming to indicate that the order of these clauses is comparatively unimportant, militates against the idea that the one clause should be disjoined from the other and from all the other clauses which follow, and erected into a separate commandment.⁴

But Popery boasts of its unity, an unity not confined to the British islands, and it is therefore fair, in regard to this impor-

¹ Quoted in the Protestant, No. xlvi.

² Lingard, Catech. Instruct., p. 80.

³ Exod. xx. 17.

⁴ Mr Cunninghame of Lainshaw's "Apostasy of the Church of Rome," quoted in the Protestant, No. xlvi.

tant point of its mode of dealing with the Second Commandment, to look into the catechisms or books of popular instruction, which it provides for other countries.

In the "Uffizio della B. V. Maria," &c., (already quoted), in an edition so recent as the year 1845, and bearing the "Re-imprimatur" of authoritative ecclesiastics, the commandments are given in the following words,—

"Comandamenti di Dio—

1. Io sono il Signore Iddio tuo: non avrai altro Dio avanti di me.
2. Non nominare il nome di Dio in vano.
3. Ricordati di santificare le feste.
4. Onora il padre e la madre.
5. Non ammazzare.
6. Non fornicare.
7. Non rubare.
8. Non dire il falso testimonio.
9. Non desiderare la donna d'altri.
10. Non desiderare la roba d'altri.¹

Here the Second Commandment is totally suppressed. And it may be observed in passing, that the Fourth Commandment is altered in the most audacious manner. We have seen that even the Most Rev. Dr James Butler retains it, only abridging it into the briefest preceptive form, but this Roman school-book converts it into *Remember to keep holy the feasts*. This is the Popery of Rome, and of the high ecclesiastics there. How differently Popery endeavours to represent itself in this land of Protestant light! Is not this indeed the apostasy marked by "all deceivableness of unrighteousness?"² Is not this indeed the power that thinketh to change times and laws?³

M'Gavin, in The Protestant, mentions a Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French Empire, which abridges the First and Second Commandments into these words, "Thou shalt

¹ Uffizio della B. V. Maria, &c.—*Preci Quotid.*, p. 8.

² 2 Thess. ii. 10.

³ Dan. vii., 25.

worship one God.”¹ I have at present before me a little French catechism, published apparently about the year 1829, in which the abridgment is equally complete, the precept however being further modified, and expanded again to accommodate it to a rude versification,—

“Un seul Dieu tu adoreras
Et aimeras parfaitement.”²

Also in a little Spanish catechism of 1824, the enumeration of the commandments begins thus;—

“El primero, amar á Dios sobre todas las cosas,”

[“The first, to love God above all things.]

“El segundo, no jurar,” &c.,

[“The second, not to swear,” &c.]³

The omission of the Second Commandment is justified by Gother, on the ground that he who has learned the First Commandment, “Thou shalt have no other gods before me,” would be “out of all danger of falling into any superstitious worship or idolatry” “for want of the Second, there being nothing in this, but what he is fully and expressly instructed in by having learned the First, it being rather an explication of this than any new and distinct precept.”⁴ The presumption displayed in such an argument is marvellous, so evidently does the man set himself in opposition to God, and arrogate to himself to be wiser than God. Dr Doyle in his examination before Parliament in 1825, shewed more ingenuity, maintaining that what Protestants call the Second Commandment was *ceremonial*, relative to the

¹ See the Protestant, No. xvii.

² Petit Catechisme, ou Abrégé de la Doctrine chrétienne, imprimé par permission de S. A. Em. Mgr. le Cardinal Prince de Croy, Archevêque de Rouen, Primat de Normandie, &c. &c. A Rouen. Here, however, the fourth [third] commandment is—

“Les Dimanches tu garderas
En servant Dieu dévotement.”

³ Catecismo de la Doctrina Cristiana, &c. &c. Por el padre Gaspar Astete. Sevilla, 1824. Here the fourth commandment is, to sanctify the feasts, “sanctificar las fiestas.”

⁴ Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented. Chap. 23.

peculiar circumstances of the Jews, and now no longer necessary to be added to the First. The disingenousness which he manifested in connection with this subject deserves at least as much consideration as his argument. Though “the entire words” were not put down, the “substance of them” he said, was “clearly put down.” But he was closely pressed.

“Have the goodness to state the words which you conceive convey the substance of the passages which are omitted in the smaller Catechisms. Are they any other but ‘I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt have no other gods before me?’

No, I believe not; these are quite sufficient.

You consider these words as commensurate with the second commandment, according to the authorized version?

Certainly I do; for that latter part of the commandment is rather a ceremonial part than one founded on the law of nature. The law of nature and the positive law of God forbid idolatry, but the very making of images seems to have been prohibited to the Jewish people, on account of their propensity to idolatry. Now, when idolatry had ceased throughout the greater part of the earth, and the religion of Christ was established in its place, there was no necessity for inculcating that ceremonial part on a new people, who had been far removed from the revolting idea of worshipping things made by the hands of man. Therefore, that part which is founded on the law of nature is retained, and that part which was more ceremonial than derived from the nature of man or the wisdom of God, is left out, because no longer necessary for the new people. Therefore, I conceive that the commandment, in its present shape, contains all the doctrine necessary to be conveyed to the people of God in these our times, and that the addition respecting the making of images is quite unnecessary now as a matter of instruction in the faith.”¹

Even here there is a very evident usurpation of God's right to legislate, and an arrogation by man of greater wisdom than his. Dr Doyle indeed speaks of that which is left out as being “more ceremonial than derived from the nature of man or the wisdom of God,” but he does not say from whose wisdom it was derived, if not from that of God, when it was uttered by his voice amidst the thunderings of Sinai, and written by his finger on the table of stone. Nor does he say whose wisdom has de-

¹ Quoted by Dr Cunningham, Notes to Stillingfleet, Doct. and Pract., ch. xxv.

cided on the omission of it now as unnecessary "for the new people."

But it is worthy of observation how readily men who wish to get quit of a positive commandment of God fall back upon the law of nature, that is, upon their own notions of the law of nature,—upon the law of nature such as men choose to represent it to themselves irrespective of revelation, and under the deluding influence of their own natural corruption and inflamed passions. We see Dr Doyle here doing this with reference to the Second Commandment; there are many in our times, some of whom call themselves Protestants, who do the same thing with regard to the Fourth; and it is a favourite expedient with those who wish to get quit of certain portions of the law of incest and to legalize men's marriages with the sisters of their deceased wives.

And the same arguments are applicable here as in reference to the Fourth Commandment, to prove it not merely Jewish and ceremonial but moral and general,—especially its position in the decalogue, and the manner in which the commandments of the decalogue were uttered and written by God.¹

Dr Milner says little on this subject. He thinks it a sufficient answer to the charge of suppressing the Second Commandment, and to make up the deficiency, splitting the Tenth into two, to allege that, "in the original Hebrew, and in

¹ Dr Lingard's mode of dealing with the prohibition of image worship is substantially the same with that of Dr Doyle, already noticed. He refers to the conduct of the Israelites in making the golden calf and worshipping it, he endeavours in a brief note to refute "the notion of certain moderns" that the idolatrous worship of the Israelites "was referred to some invisible being and not to the image itself," and he draws a distinction between the positive precept which he alleges to have been peculiar to the Israelites, as called for by certain peculiar circumstances in their condition, and "the moral precept of not giving to any created being the worship due to God." (*Catech. Instr.*, 58, 59.) All this merely calls for a repetition of the remarks already made on the incorporation of this precept in the law which God pronounced with his own voice from Sinai, amidst the thunderings and the lightnings, and the earthquake, and which he wrote with his own finger on the tables of stone.

the several copies and versions of it, during some thousands of years, there was no mark of separation between one commandment and another, so that we have no rules to be guided by in making the distinction, but the sense of the context and the authority of the most approved fathers; both which," says he, "we follow."¹ Even for justification of an unnatural arrangement of the commandments, this is ridiculous; but how much more so when we come to consider it in reference to the entire suppression of the Second Commandment, such as we have seen in Dr Butler's and other Catechisms! It is worth while to observe how adroitly Dr Milner, after stating the charge in its worst form, frames his reply to it as if he had understood it in no other sense than that in which it might have been applied to such an arrangement as Lingard's. So slippery are Popish controversialists!

It is remarkable, that whilst two entire lessons and part of another lesson² of the Most Rev. Dr James Butler's Catechism are devoted to "the First Commandment," no mention whatever is made of the omitted commandment which Papists represent as an appendix to the First, and this although in these very lessons we have a discussion about the honour due to saints, accompanied with references to various passages of Scripture, and to one place of the Apocrypha. It seems strange that a portion of Scripture so apposite to the subject should so entirely have escaped the Most Reverend Doctor's observation,—nay, that he should have found it possible to pass over its plain meaning, when out of the First Commandment he contrived to extract a strong condemnation of "theatrical representations, and of other amusements, particularly at wakes, in which religion, its ministers, and other sacred ceremonies, are ridiculed," of which he says, "They are impious and highly criminal, and strictly forbidden by the First Commandment."³ But where the dignity of ministers of religion was concerned, there was perhaps a

¹ Milner, *End of Controv.*, Letter xxxiv.

² Lessons xiv., xv., xvi.

³ Lesson xvi., last question.

reason for more acuteness than where nothing was involved but the salvation of sinners and the glory of God.

Papists tell us, when they desire to evade a charge which they find it difficult to repel, that it is only in their smaller catechisms that the Second Commandment is omitted. So said Dr Doyle, in the examination already referred to. So says Gother, in his *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, with some fine words about a "compendious and easy method," adopted "in condescension to weak memories and low capacities." So says the authoress of *Geraldine*.¹ But, however true it may be that the words of the Second Commandment are given in some, at least, of the larger catechisms and manuals, it is also true, that except where it is necessary for purposes of controversy, very little notice is taken of them. And in the large work on moral theology, by Saint Alphonso Liguori, we find many pages devoted to the "First Commandment," whilst not even one of these is given to the subject of the use of images; and although *idolatry* is mentioned, (*"Quid, et quotuplex sit idololatria?"*) it is dismissed in less than a page, whilst simony, sacrilege, divination, &c., &c., are largely discussed, forty pages being given to simony alone.

Still more revolting, if possible, to reason and piety, than the Popish worship of images,—still more unworthy of God and even of man,—is the worship of relics, or of things which are called relics, holy coats like that of Treves, rags, clouts, bones, and whatever might be picked up in charnel house or lumber room.

Relics were at one time very abundant in this country, and afforded a theme on which the poets who satirized the Popish priesthood, at and before the Reformation, delighted to expatiate. The very grossness of the Popish idolatry facilitated the work of the Reformers. Then for a long time Papists seemed to be well aware that it was their interest and made it their policy to con-

¹ *Geraldine*, II., 329.

ceal as much as possible this grossness from the people of this country. Images were therefore comparatively rare, and were by no means ostentatiously exhibited, and relics appear to have been rarer still, especially of those kinds, the mention of which is most calculated to excite contempt or indignation in enlightened minds. That there has of late been a change in this respect, that images and relics have begun again to be restored to something more like the place which they occupy in Popish countries, or which they occupied in this country before the Reformation, may be accepted perhaps as a proof, along with others, of the increasing zeal of the Popish priesthood, but is interesting also as a proof of that madness which precedes and precipitates destruction.

Dr Milner is very cautious and reserved on this subject, conjoining it with that of images under the general head of Religious Memorials, and passing rapidly and delicately over it.

"You will observe," he says, "that among religious memorials, I intend to include *relics*, meaning things which have, some way, appertained to, or been *left* by, personages of eminent sanctity. Indeed the ancient fathers generally called them by that name. Surely Dr Porteous will not say, that there is no warrant in Scripture for honouring these, when he recollects, that *from the body of Saint Paul were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs and aprons, and the diseases departed from them*, (Acts xix., 12,) and that, *when the dead man was let down, and touched the bones of Elisha, he revived and stood upon his feet*, (2 Kings, xiii., 21.)"¹

Here is caution enough in the avoidance of all question as to the sort of honour to be given to relics, the degree in which a natural feeling towards them may be indulged, or the way in which it ought to be expressed. Nothing is said about genuflections and prostrations before them, about kissing them, or about burning incense in their honour. In reference to these ordinary practices of his Church, Dr Milner's quotations from Scripture would seem little enough to the purpose. Nor are they much to the purpose in any view, however dexterously introduced in connection with a mere general mention of relics. That "God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul,"

¹ Milner, *End of Controv.*, Letter xxxiv.

during his residence at Ephesus, "so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them,"¹ even as the sick in Jerusalem were healed at an earlier period by the very shadow of Peter passing by,² is what no one doubts who believes his Bible; but it by no means appears that such a virtue was permanently attached to the body of Paul or to the shadow of Peter, or that these handkerchiefs and aprons retained their efficacy after the special occasion for which they were employed, and on which God was pleased thus to signify his approbation of his apostles, and to seal their doctrine with his testimony. And these are the things which Papists would require to prove, and not only so, but that the alleged relics were honoured by men in the way in which relics are honoured in the Popish Church, and that by the command or with the approval of God. These points must be established ere the pretended argument from Scripture can be of any avail. But this is not the way in which Papists deal with it and employ it. If all this could be proved, we might concede to them what would still be wanting to their argument, that the same virtue was possessed by all the handkerchiefs or aprons of Paul and of all the other apostles, and that the argument might be transferred from the relics of the apostles to relics of other saints; we might be ready to accept as possessed of permanent miracle-working efficacy all the mouldering bones and rags whose alleged origin they could incontestably prove. But on the contrary, it is most obvious from the Scripture narrative that the miracles were special,—and if no such power was permanently resident in Paul, much argument is not needed to shew that it was not permanently resident in the handkerchiefs.

Similar observations apply to the case of the dead man who touched the bones of Elisha. The miracle was special,³ and

¹ Acts xix., 11, 12.

² Acts v., 15.

³ Of this even Dr Wiseman seems to be aware, although it is so subversive of his whole argument. "What did God thereby shew," says he "but that the bones of his saints were sometimes gifted by him with a

intended to recal an idolatrous rebellious people to the consideration of the reproofs which that prophet had uttered, and of the truths which he had taught, that they might return again to the God of their fathers, whose witness he had been amongst them. But the people do not seem to have imagined for a moment that the prophet's bones were permanently invested with any miracle-working power. We do not read that they raised them up and enshrined them and preserved them as relics. Was this because they were poor ignorant people, lapsing into heathen idolatry? Papists should inform us what relics the Jews possessed in the best days of their Church. But what a treasure a probable bone of Elisha would be to a Popish cathedral!

But there are other instances of the same kind, which are made to do service in the same way in this argument. Mr Keenan refers to the miracle wrought when Elisha struck the waters of Jordan with the *mantle* of Elias, and to the "wonders performed by means of the *rod* of Moses," and "the wonders God was pleased to perform on account of the *ark*, which was *certainly a mere relic*."¹ Of the ark, enough has been said already. But if the reference to it implies the greatest amount of ignorance and error, that to the *rod* of Moses is perhaps even more preposterous. The argument would be more to the purpose, if we read of any miracles performed by it throughout subsequent ages of Jewish history, or by Aaron's rod which budded, and which was certainly kept as a memorial in the temple. There is still another instance, which Mr Keenan adduces, following Scheffmacher, and according to the example of many great divines of his Church. It is that of the woman who was healed by touching the hem of our Saviour's garment! Here is a miracle wrought by a relic indeed! a proof that, as Mr Keenan says, "God himself has honoured relics, and through them

supernatural power: and that on an occasion when, apparently, there was no expectation of any such extraordinary miracle?" (Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 119.)

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. 2.

wrought astonishing miracles!"¹ Cardinal Wiseman also gives considerable prominence to this instance.

"We read, that a woman was cured who touched the hem of our Saviour's garment, that the very skirts of his raiment were impregnated with that power which issued from him, so as to restore health, without his exercising any act of his will. These examples prove that God makes use of the relics of his saints as instruments for his greatest wonders."²

We read, certainly, in the Bible, what Dr Wiseman here first asserts; but where do we read the rest? I do not recollect to have ever read any of these things until I saw them in Dr Wiseman's Lectures. That our Lord did not exercise any act of his will in the cure of the woman, is a bold and gratuitous assumption. And what can be more ridiculous than to regard the hem of our Saviour's garment as in this case equivalent to a Popish relic? We do not read, at least in the Bible, of our Lord's distributing shreds of it amongst his disciples.

It may be worth while to notice the form in which this Popish argument is cast, as it may be found in a little controversial work of last century, which has been reprinted from time to time, and seems still to enjoy a considerable reputation amongst Papists. The narrative of the miracle wrought on the woman who had the issue of blood, having been quoted from Mat. ix., 20, &c., it is added:—

"Here is a miracle wrought in favour of a woman for devoutly touching a relic, to wit, the hem of our Saviour's garment; at the same time, he expressly commends her faith for so doing. Now it is impossible that Christ, who is truth himself, should work a miracle in favour of an error, or that he should commend a person's faith, if it were vain and superstitious, and not true faith. Then the faith, which Roman Catholics have in holy relics, is true faith."³

The way could be greatly cleared for this argument, if it could only be shewn that the woman who touched the hem of

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. 2.

² Wiseman, Lect. on Prin. Doct., II., 120.

³ The Protestant's Trial in controverted points of Faith, by the written word. (Lond. 1843, p. 34.)

our Saviour's garment gave it any honour or veneration such as Papists give to the relics with which their faith is so much occupied. But what seems to be wanting here, is supplied, at least as far as confident assertion can serve to supply it, in reference to the shadow of Peter's body. For after the words of Acts v., 14, 15, have been quoted, "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes of both men and women: insomuch, that they brought forth the sick into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches; that at least the shadow of Peter passing by, might overshadow some of them,"—there follows this pithy sentence:—

"The holy Scripture here remarks, that the primitive Christians had a singular veneration for the very shadow of St Peter's body; may not Roman Catholics then, without superstition or idolatry, have as much veneration for the body itself of St Peter, now his soul is in glory, as those primitive Christians had for the shadow of it?"¹

Here the foundation of the whole argument is laid by a mere effort of imagination, and the author having imagined that the primitive Christians had a singular veneration for Peter's shadow, imagines further that the Holy Scripture *remarks* this, in a place where no such remark is to be found.

It is worthy of particular observation, that by citing the passages of Scripture to which our attention has now been directed, the most cautious Popish writers inadvertently commit themselves upon a point, with regard to which they are very anxious to avoid doing so. In adducing these texts they must be held to give as a reason for the honour to be paid to relics, *some virtue resident in them*. And this is manifestly the real reason why they are so much esteemed by the multitudes of Popish lands.

Dr Wiseman tries to guard himself against admitting that there is any virtue resident in relics. Yet, as we have seen, he speaks of the very skirts of our Saviour's raiment being "impregnated with that power which issued from him, so as to

¹ Protestant's Trial, p. 35.

restore health without his exercising any act of his will." And his very denial of a virtue resident in relics is accompanied with an extraordinary and most significant limitation. After pointing out some such uses of these religious memorials as the advocates of Popery generally think it proper to place in the foreground, he says,—

"So long as we believe that there is no virtue in them, independently of a bestowal from the goodness and power of God, this cannot be called superstition."¹

"INDEPENDENTLY OF A BESTOWAL FROM THE GOODNESS AND POWER OF GOD!" What remains, then, to afford a possibility of superstition but the belief that they are independent divinities? But, says Dr Wiseman,

"The belief of the Catholic simply is, that as it has pleased God to make use of such objects as instruments for performing great works and imparting great benefits to his people, they are to be treated with respect, and revered in the humble hope that he may again so use them in our favour; and thus we consider them as possessing that symbolic virtue which I have described."²

And is this, indeed, a mere symbolic virtue? Are those to be called mere *religious memorials* which we are to look upon as instruments probably to be employed for the performance of great works in our favour? What more than this does the African expect from the written prayer which he bears about his person as a charm?

But why should we speak of Africans and their charms when Papists themselves exhibit just the same sort of attachment to their scapulars, and ascribe to them the same sort of value? "In order to gain these indulgences, a person should be invested with and wear the scapular," it is said in a Treatise on the "Advantages and Indulgences of the Ancient Confraternity of our Blessed Lady of Mount Carmel;"³ and after a story of the

¹ Wiseman, Lect. on Principal Doct., II., 119.

² Ibid.

³ A Treatise, &c.—*Superiorum permissu*; London, Thomas Richardson and Son.

miraculous revelation of our Lord's will that a scarlet scapular of the passion should be made after a certain pattern and worn by the faithful, we are told in Grimley's "Devotions, Indulgences, and Advantages of the Scapular of the Passion," already quoted, that "the holy Pontiff, Pius IX.," when he heard of it, "seemed delighted at seeing a new means brought forward to assist in promoting the salvation of souls." "We can have no doubt," says Mr Grimley, "that particular blessings are conferred on those who wear this scapular."¹

Mr Keenan tells us that Catholics honour relics only "as precious remains, which bring to their remembrance distinguished sanctity, and as dear pledges which animate their confidence in the communion and intercession of saints."² This is, no doubt, very unlike gross idolatry. But then, how are they honoured? In the words of a question asked by Bishop Challoner in his Catholic Christian Instructed, "Are not candles allowed to burn before them, and are they not sometimes fumed with incense?"³ Mr Keenan is indeed careful, after the manner of Popish controversialists in general, to assure us that Catholics do not "adore or worship relics," that "this would be rank idolatry," that "all Catholics can with a safe conscience say, 'Cursed is he who commits idolatry, who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God.'" No, we do not suppose that they worship them *for God*, though we charge them with giving them a homage inconsistent with the proper and spiritual worship of God, yea with giving them a homage due to him alone, however it may be expressed in modes such as *fuming* and *burning of candles*, wholly different from those which he now appoints for his own worship. We cannot but remember that candles and incense were used in his temple under the Jewish dispensation, that no such expressions of homage were allowed *save in that temple and to Him who was worshipped there*, and that Hezekiah brake the brazen serpent in pieces when it ceased to be regarded

¹ Devotions, Indulgences, &c., pages 5 and 13.

² Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. 2.

³ Challoner, Cath. Chr. Inst., ch. xxvi.

as a mere memorial, and *the children of Israel did burn incense to it*. But Popery is ingenious in refinements and nice distinctions. So of course there must be a difference betwixt burning incense *to* relics and fuming them *with* incense. It is only of a piece with the distinction betwixt *Dulia* and *Latreia*, under cover of which is concealed so vast a mass of idolatry, sophistry, and falsehood.

But what is Mr Keenan to say of Aquinas, a canonized saint, who says, "If we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped with *divine worship*; both as it represents Christ, and touched the members of his body, and was sprinkled with his blood: And for these reasons, we both speak to the cross, and pray to it, as if it were Christ crucified upon it."¹

It may be as well here to notice Bishop Challoner's reply to his question already quoted. He is treating of the kind of honour allowed to relics, which of course he maintains to be only "an inferior and relative honour, as to things belonging to God's saints; but by no means divine honour." "But are not candles," he then asks, allowed to burn before them; and are they not sometimes fumed with incense?" "These," he replies, "are honours indeed, *but such as we may give to one another; as in effect we incense in the Church both clergy and people, and burn candles to our princes upon occasions of joy*; for since these honours are no ways appropriated to God," &c. &c.² It is needless to quote more of an argument resting upon such a foundation. Reference has been already made to the worship of God in the Jewish temple, which may shew whether these honours are in their nature peculiar to God's worship or not; but how does the Popish bishop defend the application of them to relics? They are such honours as we may give to one another! the burning of the candles before relics is likened to the illuminations when a sovereign or prince enters a town, and the fuming of them with incense to the incensing of clergy and

¹ Quoted in the Protestant, No. lii.

² Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. xxvi.

people in the Popish service. But the falsehood of this representation becomes evident, if we consider that these are merely old practices of the Pagan idolatry which the Church of Rome has adopted. It is true that Papists now-a-days attempt so to explain the use of candles and incense as to disguise their heathenish origin, and to obviate the charge of idolatry which is founded upon them. Challoner tells us, in another part of the work just quoted,¹ that lighted candles are placed on the altar at the time of the mass—

"to honour the triumph of our king, which is here celebrated by these lights, which are tokens of our joy and of his glory; secondly, to denote the light of faith with which we are to approach him;" also that "incense is used in the mass and other offices of the Church, because incense is an emblem of prayer, ascending to God from a heart inflamed with his love, as the smoke of the incense ascends on high from the fire of the censer."

Here it is obvious that a meaning is ascribed to the incense and also to the candles, such as compels the inference of idolatry from their use in respect to images and relics; for being held significant of the most essential parts of divine worship, they cannot be applied to any other religious use without confusion and the breaking down of all distinction betwixt the worship of God and the honour given to creatures. The same remark may be made of other forms employed in the veneration of images and relics. It is mere trifling with the subject to bring in an argument from what is done in things *certainly not religious*, as in illuminations on occasion of a royal progress or a national triumph. And whereas Bishop Challoner is careful to remark, in connection with the statement last quoted, that "Moreover, the incensing of the altar, of the priest, &c., is according to the use of the Church a token of honour to the thing that is incensed; not of divine honour, since we also incense the whole choir and the people, but of due respect for the things of God, for his ministers and people,"—it is impossible not to observe that this has all the appearance of an after thought,

¹ Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. vii.

designed to obviate the objections of heretics. And it ought to be borne in mind that quite another account than this of *due respect*, can be given of the incensing of the choir and the people, manifesting the derivation of the Popish incensing, not from the use of incense in the Jewish temple, where it was exclusively appropriated to the worship of God, and its use to give honour or respect of any sort to any creature would have been the uttermost profanation, but from the temples of Jupiter and Juno, and other gods and goddesses anciently worshipped in Rome.

On this, as well as other questions, Popish writers generally take refuge in tradition. Into this branch of their argument, I shall refrain, as upon former points, from attempting to follow them. Nor would I have alluded to it at all, worthless as it is in its very nature, had it not been for the reference which is made to Jerome and his book against Vigilantius. To this, with other authorities, Cardinal Wiseman specially appeals, and speaks of Jerome as one whom none can refuse to call a *saint*, a *chosen, favoured spirit*.¹ Mr Keenan tells us that "Saint Jerome wrote a whole book against Vigilantius, who was the first to deny honour to holy relics."² Mr Keenan, and Scheffmacher, whose words he here adopts, are by no means singular in making this assertion with regard to Vigilantius. It is very generally made by Popish writers. But there can be no more unwarranted assumption. Granting that Vigilantius was the first of whom we knew that vigorously and earnestly assailed the veneration of relics, this might be more rationally explained by supposing him a reformer than by supposing him an innovator. The question must be decided by anterior proof. But this is to touch upon the argument, whereas I meant only to remark how much reason the Popish Church has to be proud of its Saint Jerome, and of his book against Vigilantius. The art of abuse was carried to perfection when that holy man wrote. The abusive language

¹ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 114 and 126.

² Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xvi., sect. 2.

sometimes employed by Martin Luther is often alleged by Papists,—by Mr Keenan, for example,—as a proof that he was not a man of God;¹ and Protestants, whilst they deny the inference, regret many of his expressions, and by no means feel themselves called upon to justify his violence or that of any other Reformer. But what are Papists to say of a canonized saint, a "chosen, favoured spirit," who pours forth abuse like an infuriated drunkard, a saint whose works of supererogation went to the storehouse from which Popes dispense merits to poor needy Papists who perform no works of supererogation themselves? Vigilantius, according to the saint of Bethlehem, had opened his fetid mouth, fraught with a putrid stench, against the relics and ashes of the martyrs! He was a Samaritan, a Jew, and a madman disgorging a filthy surfeit! He was a useless vessel, which should have been shivered by the *iron rod* of apostolic authority! A tongue he had, fit only to be cut out! He was a maniac, a portent, and one who well deserved, with Ananias, Sapphira, and Simon Magus, to be consigned to eternal darkness! He was a dog, a monster, a servant of the devil, a blasphemer, a heretic, an ass, a fool, a sot, a glutton, a dreamer!² And what had the poor man done to provoke to such fury a saint and recluse? "The sum and substance of Jerome's indictment amounts to this," says Dr Gilly,³ "that Vigilantius denied the sanctity of relics; that he refused to worship and to burn lights at the tombs of the martyrs, and to invoke saints; that he disapproved of vows of celibacy, of pilgrimages, and of nocturnal watchings in cemeteries; that he doubted the presence of departed spirits at the places where their bodies were buried; that he questioned the tales of miracles said to have been wrought at the sepulchres of the martyrs; and that he protested against the imputed efficacy of prayers, either for or to the dead. Unfortunately, we have nothing left but Jerome's account of the contro-

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. iii., sec. 1.

² I have adopted this summary from Taylor's Ancient Christianity, I., 339, *note*.

³ Article Vigilantius, in seventh edition of Encyclopædia Britannica.

versy; and Vigilantius only speaks for himself in the pages of his adversary, in some of which he is represented precisely in the same light, and almost in the same words as the early Christians were by their Pagan calumniators."

It would be interesting to know from Cardinal Wiseman, or Mr Keenan, or any of the other Popish priests who in our day refer to the book which Jerome wrote against Vigilantius, whether they approve of the language and sentiments of that eminent saint of their calendar, and whether they think it right, (the prudence is not the thing in question), to apply them to us, who now hold the opinions which provoked his indignation. History is much in error, if the Popish Church has not often acted upon the good saint's suggestion of cutting out the tongue. Would our Popish neighbours approve of putting it in practice again, if opportunity were afforded? In the meantime, however, they refrain from quoting the abusive parts of the book against Vigilantius.¹

There are some peculiarities in Dr Challoner's mode of conducting his argument on the subject of relics, which may perhaps repay a few moments' attention. Dr Challoner is in so high repute, and his writings so largely circulated amongst the Papists of Great Britain, that he cannot be lightly dismissed as a man too weak to damage his cause by the weakness of his arguments. Yet it is impossible to conceive anything more puerile and wretched than what we find him condescending to. In answer

¹ But that Vigilantius was even the first to raise the standard of opposition to the relic worship and other common idolatries of the time, is contrary to the intimations which the writers of that time themselves make as to the state of opinion and feeling around them. Allusions are made to impugnors of the general practices, and the violence displayed on their behalf is instructive. "In fact," says Taylor, "the existence of a somewhat formidable opposition, and the prevalence of a whispered contempt, might be inferred from the very style of extravagance in which the Church writers indulge." (Ancient Christianity, I., 335.) Even as in our own day, the reality of an extensive and blessed work of conversion from Popery in Ireland, might be inferred from the ravings of Priest Cahill, and the prodigious fury of the Popish party in general.

to the question "What reason has the Church for shewing this respect to the dead bodies or bones of the saints?" he begins—

"1st, Because they have been the living temples of God, which his Divine Majesty has in a particular manner inhabited, and which he has sanctified by his presence and grace; and therefore if God required of Moses, *Exod.* iii., 5, and of Joshua, *Josh.* v., 15, to loose their shoes from off their feet, in respect to the ground on which they stood, as being rendered holy by his presence, or that of his angels, we must conclude that it is agreeable to his divine majesty that we should testify the like honour to the venerable earth of the bodies of the saints, which he in such an extraordinary manner has sanctified by abiding in them as in his temples."

How large a quantity of the otherwise common materials of this world may thus become sanctified by connection with each individual saint, Dr Challoner and the other Popish doctors leave to conjecture. But if it be hard to defend the multiplication of legs or arms, thumbs or great toes, beyond the number which the saint actually possessed during life,—there can be no cause of surprise, that at least whole waggon loads of various commodities claim respect and adoration. That the ground on which Moses or Joshua was commanded to loose his shoes from off his feet, continued always to be invested with the same character of holiness, would require to be proved, but is not. Waiving these considerations, however, we find Dr Challoner's first reason in still other respects, to insult the understanding of men and offer defiance to common sense. For who knows not that every true Christian is a living temple of God? as the Apostle Paul asserts, founding upon the assertion an argument against fornication. So that this reason for the veneration of relics would be of more extensive application than its inventor appears to have imagined; and we need not trouble ourselves with any further examination of the incoherency of its parts.

But if this first reason be so inconvenient through its applicability to a multitude of persons besides those whom the learned Bishop had in his view, what shall be said of his second reason?

¹ Challoner, *Cath. Christian Instructed*, ch. xxvi.

"2dly, We know that the bodies of the saints are pre-ordained to a happy resurrection and eternal glory; and upon this account also deserve our respect."¹

The argument is framed as if this happy resurrection and eternal glory were peculiar to those who have been canonized at Rome. The certainty of our knowledge cannot make the object in itself more worthy of worship, nor our uncertainty make it less worthy; and moreover, Dr Challoner himself does not seem quite sure that the faithful in the Church of Rome may not sometimes even be imposed upon, and led to honour a false relic for a true one, but he consoles them with the assurance that there would be little harm done, and "neither any idolatry nor superstition in the case, but a mistake, on their part innocent."

Dr Challoner proceeds to discuss a point which many other writers, perhaps more sagaciously, avoid,—namely the apparent scandal of divers churches pretending to possess the body of the same saint, or other things of the like kind. For which he finds divers excuses. First, he says,—

"It often happens that some part of the body is in one place, and some part in another; in which case, both places claim the body of such a saint, though they really possess only a part of it; and yet neither the one nor the other is to be charged with honouring false relics."²

It does not seem to occur to him that both the one and the other might be charged with telling lies. Too well aware, however, that this answer would never do by itself, as so many of the cases alleged against the Church of Rome do not admit of being thus explained away; he supplements it with a second,—

"Many of the saints and martyrs have borne the same name; and hence it easily happens, that relics, which indeed belong to one saint, are attributed to another of the same name."

So that if a devout Papist is not venerating the bone of one St Peter, he may console himself with the reflection that it is the bone of another St Peter, and the veneration is not lost. Yet it is not quite so clear that the bone of one St Peter is quite as

¹ Challoner, as last quoted.

² Ibid.

good as the corresponding bone of another St Peter; nor would Protestant inquisitiveness pass altogether unconsidered the process by which the bone of an inferior saint of the same name gained the reputation of belonging to the great Apostle: for this it may be presumed is the order and progress of such change. However, if the second reason be not yet good enough, the Bishop is ready with a third and last, which he seems to think must surely serve,

"There have been many ancient martyrs, whose names at present are not known, whose relics nevertheless have been all along honoured by the Church; now it was easy that the ignorance of some, or the vanity of others, might attribute to them the names of other saints; so that all these may be true relics, notwithstanding they do not all belong to the saints to whom they are attributed."

Alas! what strong delusion is here exhibited,—in the man who could frame such arguments, or at least in the people who can be satisfied by them! "All these may be true relics!" But perhaps they may not. And then if these are not, what better evidence is there that others are which are not involved in any similar scandal? And again, let it be observed how this grave bishop would teach his pupil to take for granted that amidst a tissue of fabrications and lies, and errors resulting from the ignorance of some and the vanity of others, there probably existed in each case a nucleus of truth, and in fact that the alleged relic ought to be venerated, all the scandal notwithstanding, much to the profit of holy Church, which may find it convenient to have two or three skulls of St Peter rather than one.

Some Popish writers, however, contrive to establish a sort of connection betwixt even the spurious relics and the saints whose names they bear. One example more must be given of a mode of argument which never fails, and never can fail, in any case in which its assistance is required. The subject under consideration is the existence of two heads of St John the Baptist.

"Of course, supposing the account correct, one cannot be, and neither may be, the relic of that saint. But it is certain, that to whatever saints these relics belong, God has given power, through the intercession of Saint John the Baptist, to cure diseases, and work other miracles, by means of

these relics. The miraculous cures are certain. What matters, then, the uncertainty as to which, if either, of these heads belonged to Saint John the Baptist, since both are blessed by God? The same may be said of the supposed relics of Saint John the Evangelist."¹

It would be easy to extend the same argument to cases in which the relic never belonged to a saint at all, or was even the bone of a beast, and not of a human being.

Ere this subject be dismissed, the reader must be presented with a specimen or two of the stories regarding relics which are at this very day promulgated in this country; and that they may be in every way unexceptionable, I shall select them exclusively from the little volume of *Lives of the Saints*, issued under the editorial care of Dr Wiseman. They need no comment. In the midst of a narrative of miracles wrought by St John Joseph of the Cross, "which surpass enumeration,"² we are told that

"A cloak of his delivered a person from a raging madness, judged to be incurable; the manner of which cure was extraordinary. His mother, holding up the mantle before him, he leaped from a high window into the street, and when all thought to find him dead and crushed to atoms, he was brought up alive and whole in body and mind, and so remained to the hour of his death. With a piece of the saint's habit, Casimir Avelone cured his wife in London of a spasmodic affection in the shoulders, upon which every remedy had hitherto been tried in vain."³

These things have only to become a little more common, and Cardinal Wiseman's system of medicine will put out Allopathy, Homœopathy, Hygeianism, and Holloway's Ointment. I give only one specimen more. St John Joseph of the Cross has an apoplectic stroke:—

"The Theatine fathers, by whom he was tenderly beloved, hearing of his accident, came to visit him, and brought with them their renowned relic, the staff of St Cajetan. On its application to his head, a remarkable effect took place, which we shall relate in the words of Father Michael, by whom it was applied. 'On account of the mutual friendship,' saith he, 'subsisting between Father John Joseph of the Cross and myself, as well

¹ *Geraldine*, III., 38.

² *Lives of Saints* of 26th May 1839, p. 154.

³ *Ibid.*, 155.

as my own especial devotion and obligations towards him, I no sooner heard that he had been visited with a stroke of apoplexy, and that his death was expected, than I carried to him the staff of St Cajetan. As I touched his head therewith, there happened a prodigy, the like of which never came to pass before or since, albeit the relic is, and hath been borne continually unto many sick persons. This was, that on entering the cell of the afore-named servant of God, who was dying, and on applying the afore-named relic to his head, the staff did forthwith give certain leaps and bounds, corresponding to a melodious sound that was audible to all present. . . ."¹

Here I conclude the extract. If the reader is not moved to great contempt and disgust, he is certainly to be pitied. But the narrative does not yet conclude. Suffice it to say that there are more leapings and boundings of this wonderful stick, and more of the melodious sound.

Some parts of this subject must now be very briefly passed over. Concerning the adoration of the cross and the sign of the cross, I shall only exhibit a very few curious passages from Popish books,—the number of which, however, might be indefinitely multiplied, whilst they might also be presented in great variety.

We have seen what the canonized saint, Thomas Aquinas says, concerning the adoration of the true cross.² But Mr Keenan says, "The cross on which Christ died is not God, therefore we adore it not; we adore God alone."³ To reconcile this with the doctrine laid down by the saint, is manifestly impossible, and surely the saint must be regarded as the best expounder of the religion of Rome.

But although Mr Keenan does not attempt the explanation of what the great Saint Thomas Aquinas has said on this subject, nor take any notice of any thing of the kind said by him or by any other, he thinks it necessary to take notice of the language used in the liturgy of his Church, "We adore thy cross, O Lord!"—"Why then," he asks, "does the Church sing on

¹ *Lives of Saints* of 26th May 1839, p. 157.

² See p. 378.

³ Keenan, *Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, I., 219.

Good Friday, We adore thy cross, O Lord?" "These words," he tells us, "mean, that we prostrate ourselves before the cross to which Jesus was nailed, and on which he died for our sins. In English," he goes on to say, "the word *adore* seems exclusively applied to express the honour or worship due to God. In Hebrew and Greek it has a more extended meaning; it means prostration before others as well as God,"—and he cites passages of Scripture, for examples of its application to prostration before mere human beings. But his explanation does not accord with the language of Saint Thomas Aquinas; and in the cases to which he refers there was nothing of religious homage. Now the question is one concerning religious homage alone. And it must be acknowledged as a very unfortunate thing, and a very singular thing, that the Church of Rome, with nothing but the purest and most innocent intention, should continually happen upon the most ambiguous expressions; nor would it be easy to account in any very creditable way for her obstinate perseverance in the employment of them. And since, as Mr Keenan says, "in English, the word *adore* seems exclusively applied to express the honour or worship due to God," how comes it that the "*Crucem tuam adoramus Domine*" of the Good Friday anthem, is translated, "We adore thy cross, O Lord!" and so translated in a work approved by all the *Vicars Apostolic* of England? ¹

But it may be as well to exhibit a little more of the Good Friday service. A prayer for the deliverance of the heathen from idolatry is immediately followed by the adoration of the cross.

"Then the priest puts off his chasuble, and at the back corner of the Epistle-side uncovers the upper part of the crucifix a little, beginning the anthem, *Ecce lignum crucis*. Then the assistant clergy join with him as far as *Venite adoremus*." ²

But it is too tedious;—I shall not quote all the directions for kneeling, advancing, uncovering, elevating the crucifix a little,

¹ Husenbeth's Missal for the use of the Laity, 309.

² Ibid. 306.

kneeling, saying *Ecce lignum crucis* in a louder voice and in a still louder voice, &c., &c. But after another *Venite adoremus*,

"The priest lays down the cross on a cushion prepared for it before the altar; then putting off his shoes, he proceeds to kiss the cross, kneeling three several times. After which he resumes his shoes and chasuble. Then the clergy first, and afterwards the laity, proceed to kiss the cross." ¹

Mr Husenbeth here avoids the word *adore*; but in the Italian translation of the same direction of the Missal in the Uffizio della B. V. Maria, it is employed, and Mr Husenbeth himself employs it afterwards, not only in the translation of the anthem, as we have seen, but in the following direction:—

"Towards the end of the adoration of the cross, the candles on the altar are lighted," &c., &c. ²

In the hymns also of the same day, the adoration of the cross is expressed in such words as these—

"Crux fidelis, inter omnes
Arbor una nobilis,
Nulla silva talem profert
Fronde, flore, germine.
Dulce lignum, dulce clavos,
Dulce pondus sustinet."

Of which Mr Husenbeth's translation is as follows,—

"O faithful cross, thou stand'st alone,
None like thee in our woods is grown,
None can with thy rich growth compare,
Or leaves like thine or flowerets bear.
Sweet wood, sweet nails, both sweet and fair,
Sweet is the precious weight ye bear." ³

And of this "*Crux fidelis*" and "*Dulce lignum*" there are many appointed repetitions, whilst in another verse it is said,

"Thou wert the worthy, chosen tree,
The envied task was given to thee,
A victim for the world to bear," ⁴ &c.

¹ Husenbeth's Missal, 306, 307.

² Ibid., 310.

³ Ibid., 312.

⁴ Ibid., 312.

And again, in another hymn—

“O tree of beauty, bright and fair!
The royal purple thou dost bear,
Above all, worthy to sustain
His limbs, who on thee chose to reign.”

And again,—

“Hail then, O cross! in thee we place
Hope, firmly at this time of grace;
May graces to the just increase,
From guilt may sinners find release.”

But here the concluding lines feebly express the Latin, which is a most direct prayer to the cross itself so adored,—

“Piis adauge gratiam,
Reisque dele crimina.”¹

What English word could indeed express all this better than the word *adoration*? And what can such adoration be but abominable idolatry? Or what else is this, from the *Litany of the Holy Cross*? “O cross of Jesus, adorable cross of Jesus, help us;” and, “O cross of Jesus, altar of the most sacred holocaust, help us.”²

The sign of the cross has become one of the most marked and distinctive features of Popish superstition. It were endless to enumerate the various ways in which it is used. Without abundant crossings, nothing can be done. They are an element or accompaniment of every religious service, and the proper place for each crossing is prescribed to the performer. Nor is the use of the sign of the cross confined to the ordinary way of making it with the hand. In the blessing of the baptismal font the priest breathes three times on the water in the form of a cross. Oil is also poured upon the water in the form of a cross. The priest who baptizes makes the sign of the cross on the forehead and on the breast of the person to be baptized: he makes the sign of the cross three times in the exorcism in which he admonishes the unclean spirit to depart out of him, and then signs his forehead again with the sign of the cross, (once more addressing the Devil in these words, “And this sign

¹ Hansenbeth's Missal, 313.

² See Grimley's Scapular of the Passion.

of the holy cross, which we imprint on his forehead, mayest thou, cursed Devil, never dare to violate, through the same Christ our Lord;”) the water is poured upon his head in the form of a cross,—he is anointed with “holy chrism” on the top of his head in form of a cross, and so on.¹—When a church and altar are to be consecrated, on the eve of the consecration, “six crosses are made or painted on each side of the church at equal distances, and a taper or torch placed at each cross,”² and in the consecration service, the sign of the cross is made on the threshold,—ashes are scattered in the form of a cross on the floor,³—five crosses are made with *blessed water* on the table of the altar, “one at the centre and one at each corner,” &c. &c.

It need not be wondered at if visible marks of the cross should sometimes be seen on the bodies of saints, as is recorded of St Veronica Giuliani. “From this account it may be collected,” says her biographer, “that, on this occasion, Jesus impressed that visible mark of the cross upon her heart, which was seen, after her death, by several persons, when her body was opened for that purpose.”⁴ The only wonder is that Cardinal Wiseman should have published such a story, or permitted it to be published with the sanction of his name. But the lives published under his editorship, contain, besides other marvellous stories, of which we have already seen specimens, accounts of *stigmata* or marks of the wounds of Christ, like those in the bodies of the *Ecstatica* and *Adolorata*, concerning whom the late Earl of Shrewsbury published a pamphlet illustrative at once of his

¹ See Challoner's Cath. Chr. Instr., ch. iii., and Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II, 234-236.

² Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II, 227.

³ On which the Bishop, with the end of his crosier, writes the letters of the Greek alphabet and the letters of the Latin alphabet, the Greek on the one line and the Latin on the other, “in such a way that the first letter of each alphabet will point to an angle of the Church, and the last letter of each, to each of the opposite angles.” (Ibid., II, 228, 229.)—It sounds like the direction for some child's game, such as may be read in the *Boy's own Book*, or on the lid of a box from the toy shop.

⁴ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 240.

credulity and of his desire for the conversion of his Protestant countrymen. But a digression on stigmata, however inviting the theme, would scarcely consist with the design of this chapter.

I must pass over very hastily the subject of the worship of angels. Indeed, it is in general treated along with the worship of saints, by Popish writers themselves, and many of the arguments employed in favour of it are the same. Some of the arguments however are peculiar, especially those which are founded upon texts of Scripture. In a pamphlet by Mr Keenan on the Veneration and Invocation of Saints, Angels, and the Blessed Virgin,¹ these may be found stated at considerable length; and it may be worth while to remark in general that they proceed upon the assumption that the term *angel* in Scripture designates always a creature,² (he who appeared to Joshua as *Captain of the Lord's host*, being without hesitation represented as a mere creature,)—and upon the further assumption, more ridiculous, though not more erroneous, that every instance of reverence shewn even to a created angel upon his appearing at any time, though only such as might be shewn to an earthly superior, or of words addressed to him, is similar in its nature to the acts of homage and the devout addresses in which Papists abound to angels unseen, and of whose presence there is no manifestation whatever.

It may further be observed that the whole defence of prayer to angels proceeds upon the assumption or assertion that they are merely asked to become intercessors for men. "We hold it to be pious and profitable to apply ourselves to them" [angels and saints], says Bishop Challoner, "in the way of desiring

¹ Published also as an Appendix to his Catechism of the Christian Religion, (II., 251–295.)

² "That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of angels, is plain from Jacob's asking and obtaining the angel's blessing with whom he had mystically wrestled, Gen. xxxii. 26, and from his invoking his own angel to bless Joseph's sons, Gen. xlvii. 16." (Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxiii.)

them to pray to God for us."¹—Dr Milner undertakes to prove "that it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels,"² and never hints at any invocation of a different nature or purpose, but seems to think this is all that is requisite on behalf of his Church. Cardinal Wiseman and Mr Keenan treat the subject in the very same manner. "We have the plainest and strongest assurances," says the former, "that God does receive the prayers of the saints and angels, and that they are constantly employed in supplications in our behalf; and this is the chief fundamental principle of our belief."³ But from all this we turn to a Popish book of devotion, and the first thing that offers itself as to the purpose, is—

"A PRAYER TO YOUR ANGEL GUARDIAN.

"O angel of God, to whose care I am committed by the supreme clemency; illuminate, defend, and govern me this day in all my thoughts, words, and actions. Amen."⁴

Here is nothing of praying for us, but a prayer to the *angel guardian* for such blessings as it should be reckoned most exclusively in the power of God to bestow. Nothing can be more pitiful than the attempt made by Bishop Challoner to explain this sort of prayer into an accordance with the view which he prefers to give of this part of Popish worship. "When we beg their aid and defence, we mean to beg the aid and defence of their prayers, and that the angels to whom God has given a charge over us, would assist us and defend us against the angels of darkness."⁵ It is in vain for him or any Papist to give us such an explanation of such a prayer: and more recent apologists of Popery have generally, I think, seen it to be most prudent to let this point alone, not even suggesting to the consideration of their readers that any prayers like that above quoted are ever made.⁶

¹ Challoner, Cath. Chr. Instr., chap. xxiv.

² Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxiii.

³ Wiseman, Lectures on Principal Doctrines, II., 101.

⁴ Key of Heaven, 15.

⁵ Challoner, *ut supra*.

⁶ Cardinal Wiseman, however, is under the necessity of meeting this

Let us take another example from the same very popular little manual, recommended "to the use of the faithful" by the late Archbishop Murray of Dublin.

"A PRAYER TO OUR GUARDIAN ANGEL.

"O holy angel, to whose care God in his mercy hath committed me, I return thee now my most sincere and humble thanks; I conjure thee, O amiable guide, to continue still thy care; to defend me against my enemies; to remove from me the occasions of sin; to obtain for me a constant docility to divine inspirations; to protect me, in particular, at the hour of my death; and then to conduct me to the mansions of eternal repose, where, in thy blessed society, I may praise our Creator for ever. Amen."¹

One single expression in this prayer, (*to obtain for me, &c.*), may be regarded as having a possible reference to the intercessory prayers of the angel; but in all the other petitions the angel is directly besought to do the greatest things on behalf of the suppliant. It is not a mere multiplication of mediators of intercession with which Rome is chargeable, though that were bad enough, but in the light of these very prayers which have been quoted, she stands convicted of absolute polytheism. It is no mediator of intercession whom we have here before us, but a separate divinity,—inferior perhaps, like many of the divinities of ancient Pagan Rome, but still a divinity. And in the prayers to these new Popish divinities, there is no worship of God, and no reference to the mediation of Christ.

"We hold daily and hourly converse, says Dr Milner, "to our unspeakable comfort and advantage, with the angelic choirs."² But I must refrain from entering upon this argument of sympathy and fellowship continually brought forward by Papists when they

difficulty in the face, when adducing in favour of prayer to saints the ancient inscriptions on the tombs of the martyrs. What he says may as well be quoted here. "They do not simply say, 'Pray for us, Intercede for us,' but 'Deliver us, Grant us,' not because they believed the saints could do so of themselves, but because in common parlance it is usual to ask directly from an intercessor, the favour which we believe his influence can obtain." (Lect. on Principal Doct., II., 106.)—Is it, then, quite the same thing? or is even the statement regarding *common parlance* correct?

¹ Key of Heaven, 23.

² Milner, *ut supra*.

wish to produce in Protestant minds an impression favourable to their saint or angel worship;—although it were easy to shew that it is utterly destitute of foundation, and that whilst the sort of converse or communion which Papists pretend is a mere hallucination or deception, they egregiously misrepresent Protestantism in denying that it admits of any fellowship whatever with the "innumerable company of angels," or with the holy multitude around the throne of God, who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.¹

The worship of saints is advocated on the same general grounds with the worship of angels, and is particularly urged upon us by the argument of feeling or sympathy just noticed. The same representation is also given of it, that the saints are merely invoked in order that we may be aided by their intercessions. "Almost every sick man desires the congregation to be his mediators," says Gother, "and so the Papist desires the blessed in heaven to be his mediators, that is, that they would pray to God for him."² He wishes them, it seems, only "to join their prayers to his." "And this," he says, "is not to make them gods, but only petitioners to God; it is not to make them his redeemers, but only intercessors to his Redeemer; he having no hope of obtaining anything but of God alone, by and through the merits of Christ." Thus the doctrine of their Church is represented also by Berington and Kirk, whose *Proposition* on this

¹ The following may be taken as a specimen of the sort of assertion either direct or by implication, in which our Popish neighbours indulge upon this point. "If we throw aside for a moment dreary, dry, unloving, heartless Presbyterianism, and consult the kindlier feelings of our nature, will we not at once conclude that those bright angels, through whom redemption was announced to a lost world, will lend us all the aid in their power, and take a deep interest in our progress, until they see our redemption, in each particular case, perfected by our triumphant entry into their celestial Jerusalem? Oh! unhappy Presbyterianism! how frigid," &c., &c. (Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 276.) And Mr Keenan improves as he proceeds, building sentence after sentence upon this sub-structure, and indulging the charity of his nature in the utterance of his indignation against Calvinism.

² Gother's *Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, sect. 2.

subject is too long to quote, but concludes, (so far as it really is a *Proposition*,) with these words, (relating both to angels and saints,) "Therefore, we believe that it is good and profitable to invoke their intercession."¹ And not a hint do these ingenuous authors give us of anything beyond this. Cardinal Wiseman is at pains to assure us, that even when the form of words employed in prayers to saints is most at variance with such an intention, Papists intend nothing more than to ask the saints to intercede for them,²—and that although they say *deliver us, grant us*, it means nothing more than to ask the saints to obtain the blessings as intercessors on behalf of those who supplicate them,—a mode of interpretation which, if generally applied, would leave the Cardinal all convenient latitude in his own sentences, but might have the inconvenience of leaving the reader always in some degree of uncertainty whether he had fathomed their real meaning.

However, it is not difficult to prove, if words are to be interpreted on any ordinary principles, that there is in many Popish prayers to saints something more than the mere *Ora pro nobis*, or *Pray for us*, so common in the Litanies, and by which, according to Dr Milner's happy expression, Papists *engage the friends and courtiers of God to add the weight of their prayers to their own*.³ Even this is unscriptural, involves the ascription of omniscience or omnipresence to creatures, and derogates from the glory of Christ as the only Mediator. It would require some ingenuity to reconcile with the notion of mere intercession by the Virgin Mary that address to her so familiar to every Popish ear,—

"Dignare me laudare te, virgo sacrata,
Da mihi virtutem contra hostes tuos,"

And "*Peccatorum miserere*" is not accurately translated, what—

¹ Berington and Kirk, 428.

² See note in p. 393. Cardinal du Perron, more than two hundred years ago, tried the same evasion, or one like it, that the words "by praying for us" are always to be understood.

³ Milner, End of Controversy, Letter xxxiii.

ever may be thought of the paraphrase, when it is turned into—

"Repenting sinners by thy prayers relieve."¹

Is she only an intercessor, and in such an humble way as not to interfere with the mediatory intercession of Christ, who is invoked in these words, "Salve Regina, Mater miserecordiae, vita, dulcedo, et spes nostra, salve. [Hail, O queen, Mother of mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope, hail?]"² There is no *Ora pro nobis*, and nothing like it, in the hymn beginning, "*Memento, rerum Conditor*," in which the Virgin Mary is thus addressed,—

"Maria, Mater gratiae,
Dulcis Parens clementiae,
Tu nos ab hoste protege,
Et mortis horâ suscipe,"

Although, in the hymn beginning "*Ave, maris stella*," we have one line, ("*Bona cuncta posce*,") which seems to bear this character, yet nothing can be farther from it than the rest, as—

"Solve vincla reis,
Profer lumen caecis,
Mala nostra pelle,"

And—

"Virgo singularis
Inter omnes mitis,
Nos culpis solutos
Mites fac et castos."

The "*Stabat Mater*" and other hymns exhibit the same idolatry. What more direct or complete ascription of divine homage to a creature can be imagined than is contained in the following petitions of a prayer of Cardinal Bona to the Virgin:—"Place me near unto thee, and protect me from all my enemies, visible and invisible. *Say unto my soul, I AM THY SALVATION*. Direct me, thy servant, in all my ways and actions. Console me in all

¹ See Hymn for Advent, Gahan's Cath. Piety, 527.

² Ufficio della B. V. Maria, 18.

my griefs and afflictions. Defend and preserve me from all evils and dangers. Turn thy face unto me when the end of my life shall come; and may *thy consolation* in that tremendous hour rejoice my spirit." ¹ The following is St Bernard's prayer to the Virgin, as given in the Child's Manual, with the approval of Cardinal Wiseman.

Remember, O most holy Virgin Mary! that no one ever had recourse to your protection, implored your help, or sought your mediation without obtaining relief. Confiding therefore in your goodness, behold me, a penitent sinner, sighing out my sins before you, beseeching you to adopt me for your son, and to take upon you the care of my eternal salvation. Despise not, O mother of Jesus! the petition of your humble client, but hear and grant my prayer." ²

Now here it is very evident that the seeking of Mary's mediation is distinguished from having recourse to her protection and imploring her help. And if in the same Manual, the child is taught to say, "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and at the hour of our death," ³—the following petitions, for infant lips, are also set down,—"*Mary conceived without sin, have mercy on me, who have recourse to thee. My sweet mother, I love thee; do thou love me, and make me thy own good child, to-day and always.*" ⁴ And if it be alleged that the intention of the worshipper is only to invoke the Virgin's intercession, or that the words, "by praying for us," are always to be understood, it is surely fair to reply,—the force of the reply being increased when the prayers are looked upon as extracted from a manual for children,—"And can it be right and safe to lay such snares for the conscience? If her prayers are the sole object of the petitioner's invocation, why set him, in the solemn services of the Church, an example of prayers which make no allusion to her intercession, but ask as directly and unequivocally for her aid and blessing, as the supplications addressed to the Supreme Being ask for his?" ¹

¹ See Palmer's "Letters on some of the Errors of Romanism, in controversy with the Rev. Nicholas Wiseman, D.D.," (3d Ed., London, 1851,) 58, 59.

² The Child's Manual of Prayer, 118, 119.

³ Ibid., p. 2. ⁴ Ibid., p. 7.

cally for her aid and blessing, as the supplications addressed to the Supreme Being ask for his?" ¹

But we shall have further occasion to consider the Popish worship of the Virgin Mary, and enough has now been adduced to shew the falsehood of the pretence that all prayers to saints are merely to invoke their intercession.

And even if all these prayers had this very form, which it is granted that many of them have, it would remain to be considered not only what warrant there is for asking the saints to intercede at all, but also whether the intercession for which they are invoked does not essentially differ in its nature from that which we may ask our fellow-worshippers on earth to make on our behalf. The Apostles asked their fellow-Christians to *pray for them*, but there is a common expression in the Popish prayers to the saints which has a very different sound and a very different signification,—"*Obtain for us.*" Thus, in "a prayer to the blessed Virgin,"—"Obtain for me a cautious purity; a sincere humility; a placid resignation to the will of God," &c. ²—in another, (in the "Rosary of the Blessed Virgin,") "We beseech thee obtain for us by thine intercession, grace to lead such pure and holy lives," &c. ³—in a prayer addressed to St Juliana Falconieri, "I beseech thee to obtain for me a perfect

¹ Tyler on the Romish Worship of the Virgin Mary, (Lond. 1844), 7. I subjoin an Italian prayer to the Virgin Mary from the Ufficio della B. V. Maria, &c., already frequently referred to, (*Preci Quotid., &c.*, p. 41), as an example of the devotions approved in Rome. There is not a word of her interceding for us, but she is addressed "with lively faith," the heart is committed into her hands, and she is asked for the salvation of soul and body, and for grace to do *God's will and hers*:—

"Vergine santissima madre del verbo incarnato; tesoriaria della grazie, rifugio di noi miseri peccatori; noi ricorriamo al vostro materno amore con viva fede, e vi domandiamo la grazia di far sempre la volontà di Dio e di Voi, e diamo il cuor nostro nelle vostre santissime mani, e vi domandiamo la salute dell'anima e del corpo; e speriamo di certo che Voi nostra madre amorosissima ci esaudirete, e pero con viva fede diciamo; *Tre Ave Maria.*"

² Key of Heaven, 27.

³ Gahan's Cath. Piety, 502.

knowledge of the frailty of these earthly things," &c., &c.,—in another, "At least, O blessed saint, obtain for me a sincere repentance for my past faults."¹ Instead of these few examples, a vast number might easily be set down. Now this implies a confidence in the intercession of saints, which exalts them to a very high place as "the friends and courtiers of God,"—whilst the devotional books, with their forms of prayer, now to God, now to the Virgin, and now to some of the other saints, exhibit to us a sort of Court of Olympus rather than the heaven of our Bibles.

There is also a frequent reference to the intercession of the saints in prayers addressed to God,—as we have already seen that there is to their merits,²—which must affect our view of the very prayers made to them for their intercession. Thus we have the following prayer in the *Rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary*—

"Hear, O merciful God, the prayers of thy servants, that we who meet together in the society of the most holy Rosary of the blessed Virgin Mother of God, may, through her intercession, be delivered by thee from the dangers that continually hang over us. Amen."³

Similar in this respect is the following prayer—

"We beseech thee, O Lord, that by the intercession of the blessed and glorious Virgin Mary, of thy holy Apostles, and of all thy saints, thou wouldst vouchsafe to protect and defend us from the snares of the enemy, and conduct us into life everlasting. Amen."⁴

But such prayers abound in the Missal—

"Grant, we beseech thee, O Almighty God, that we who celebrate the solemn festival of thy blessed martyrs Gordian and Epimachus, may be helped by their intercession with thee. Through our Lord," &c.⁵

"Receive, O Lord, we beseech thee, the victim of human redemption, and being appeased by the intercession of blessed Cuthbert, thy confessor and bishop, provide for us safety of soul and body. Through our Lord," &c.⁶

¹ Lives of St Rose of Lima, &c., 411.

² See p. 71.

³ Key of Heaven, 305.

⁴ Gahan's Cath. Piety, 218.

⁵ Husenbeth's Missal for the use of the Laity, 584.

⁶ Ibid., 558.

"Sanctified by salutary mysteries, we beseech thee, O Lord, that by the intercession of Holy Joseph,¹ confessor, we may ever go forward to a greater increase of devotion. Through our Lord, &c."²

These may suffice for a specimen; but similar prayers are provided for almost every day in the year, with especial mention of the saint or saints to whom that day is dedicated.

In what higher terms could we refer to the intercession of Christ? But "he is their mediator as well as ours," says Dr Doyle, "and when we pray to them, we well know the place they hold, and that it is through Christ alone they can assist us. You may call them mediators if you will, but they mediate not like Christ, but through him. Call them intercessors if you will, but they intercede only through Christ."³ To the same purpose speak other apologists of Popery. No other reply is needed than the quotation of one prayer from the Missal, by no means, however, the only one of its kind—

"Receive this sacrifice, O most merciful God, offered to thy majesty in honour of the holy patriarch Joachim, the father of the Virgin Mary; that by his intercession, with that of his spouse, and most blessed offspring, we may deserve to obtain the entire remission of sins, and everlasting glory. Through our Lord," &c.⁴

Words could not have been selected more appropriate than these to convey the idea that the intercession of the saints is at least the same in kind, if not also in value, with the intercession of Christ.

The prayer just quoted may serve also for an example of the mass in honour of saints,—the pretended offering up of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ, in commemoration of them.

From what we have seen, the transition is easy to the patronage of saints,—the entrusting of soul and body to the particu-

¹ "Saint Joseph Calasanctius, confessor."

² Husenbeth's Missal for the use of the Laity, 683.

³ Letters of J. K. L., 278.

⁴ Husenbeth's Missal for the use of the Laity, 673.

lar protection and care of some particular saint on whose intercession dependence is placed for the obtaining of whatever concerns their welfare,—the establishment of patron saints as the holders of peculiar offices in the heavenly court, not only over particular persons, but also over particular places, affairs, periods of life, trades, &c. How far this has been carried, it would take not a few pages to shew, and I must turn aside without entering upon this part of my subject, although here are to be seen some of the most heathenish features of Popery.¹ It must be admitted, indeed, that Popery in this country is yet behind the Popery of many other parts of the world, and especially of Italy, in the prominence given to this part of the system; although we find prayers in the devotional books for the continued protection of the saints whose festivals are celebrated,² and even such petitions as this, “Thou patron of youth, St Aloysius, and all you saints and angels of heaven, pray to the Father of all,” &c.;³ the young being thus taught to repose an especial confidence in the intercession and protection of *the patron of youth, St Aloysius*. Papists are certainly encouraged to *select* the objects of their worship and religious confidence, as the ancient heathen might devote himself more particularly to Bacchus, or to Venus, or to Mars, and along with them have his chosen inferior deities. St Alphonsus Liguori, according to the biography of which Cardinal Wiseman is the editor, “declared the blessed Virgin the protectress of his order,” and, “after her, he entertained a peculiar devotion to her pure spouse, St Joseph, and also to St Teresa, whose names, with those of Jesus and Mary, he placed at the beginning of everything he wrote.”⁴ Also, according to the same volume, “next to God,” St Pacificus of San Severino “entertained a most tender devotion to Our

¹ See Poynder’s “Popery in alliance with Heathenism,” Letter iv.

² “We beseech thee, O Lord, that the continued protection of blessed Apollinaris may comfort us,” &c. &c. (Husenbeth’s Missal, 643).

³ Kenny’s Young Catholic’s Guide in preparing for Confession. (*Permissu superiorum*. Dolman, London).

⁴ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, pp. 46, 47.

Blessed Lady, the Queen of Heaven, to whom he had recourse in all the necessities of his soul,” and he felt a particular devotion towards his good angel, the chaste spouse of Mary, St Joseph, and St Francis of Assisium.¹

But passing from this in the meantime, I propose to produce further evidence that the Popish religion ascribes divine honours to saints, and conjoins their worship with the worship of God, in a way opposed to all right notions of his glory, and opposed even to the First Commandment.

In the consecration of an altar, the bishop, (having blessed water, and mingled with it blessed salt, ashes, and wine,—giving to the whole ceremony an aspect as heathenish as possible,) makes five crosses with the blessed water on the table of the altar, and says “*Be this altar sanctified in honour of the all-powerful God, the glorious Virgin Mary, and all the saints, under the name and memory of this or the other special saint, in name of the Father, and of the Son,*” &c.² God and the Virgin and the saints seem to be placed pretty much upon one level here.³ And,—that we may have the authority of Cardinal Wiseman for the other instances of a similar kind to be adduced,—looking into the Lives of the Saints of 26th May 1839, we find St Alphonsus Liguori inviting a Carmelite friar to pray for him “to God and Our Blessed Lady of the Seven Dolours.”⁴ We find also a remarkable story about the miraculous gratification of a longing for peaches, which were made to grow out of chestnut boughs, the miracle being ascribed to “the Lord, St Peter

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 189. And see p. 101 of the same volume.

² Keenan, Cat. of Chr. Rel., II., 229.

³ Similar to this is the extraordinary doxology and prayer—“*Sacro-sanctae et individuae Trinitati, crucifixi Domini nostri Jesu Christi humanitati, beatissimae et gloriosissimae semperque Virginis Mariae foecundae integritati, et omnium Sanctorum universitati, sit sempiterna laus, honor, virtus et gloria ab omni creatura, nobisque remissio omnium peccatorum, per infinita saecula saeculorum.*”—Uffizio della B. V. Maria, &c., 37.

⁴ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 50.

of Alcantara, and St Paschal." Of course Cardinal Wiseman believes this story about the peaches, than which nothing more contemptible was ever printed. I shall give it, as another illustration of the class to which it belongs, but more particularly that the reader may see the manifest exaltation of St Peter of Alcantara and St Paschal to the same grade with the Lord himself.

"In the month of February, a Neapolitan merchant tarried for him [St John Joseph of the Cross] till evening at the garden gate, and, as he entered, accosted him, beseeching him to pray in behalf of his wife, who lay at that moment in grievous danger, being seized with a violent longing for peaches, which at such a season could not be procured. The saint bade him be of good cheer, for that on the morrow, the Lord, St Peter of Alcantara, and St Paschal, would satisfy her desire. Then seeing some chestnut boughs as he was mounting the steps, he turned to his companion, 'Brother Michael,' said he, 'take four of these twigs and plant them; if so be the Lord, St Peter, and St Paschal will have regard to this poor woman's want.' Whereupon the lay brother cried out, wondering, 'Nay, father, how shall chestnut branches bear peaches?'—'Leave it in the hands of Providence,' rejoined the saint, 'and of St Peter of Alcantara.' Accordingly brother Michael obeyed, and set twigs in a flower-pot outside the saint's window. And lo! in the morning, they were covered with green leaves, and each several branch bore a beautiful peach," &c.

After this we need not be surprised to find miracles ascribed to these saints even during the days of their life on earth, which exalt them at least to an equality with our Lord himself. Thus we have it certified to us, on the authority of Cardinal Wiseman, that the secrets of hearts were not hidden from St John Joseph of the Cross, St Pacificus of San Severino, and St Veronica Giuliani.² We are assured that St Francis di Girolamo even *raised the dead*.³ Instance after instance is set down for our instruction, of St John Joseph's knowledge of distant and future

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, pp. 138, 139.

² Ibid., pp. 152, 198, 212, 267.—I think it better to refer to the stories of miracles in this volume, because of the authority (superior even to the strictures of the Dublin Review), rather than to those in the Lives of St Rose of Lima, &c., or even in Butler's Lives of the Saints. And the volume contains enough certainly for my purpose.

³ Ibid., p. 103.

events.¹ We are told that the elements obeyed this St John Joseph of the Cross,—that rain ceased at his command, when it was falling so heavily as to threaten to oblige him to seek shelter. We are told of his walking with a companion under an incessant shower, and their garments remaining dry. We are told that "the air bore to him on its wings his stick, which he had left behind."² Rain and snow never fell on St Pacificus, and it is interesting to know how reverently the birds listened to him, and what demonstrations they made of their profound respect.³ It seems to have been rather a common thing for the bodies of some of the saints, during their lives, to be in two places at the same time. Thus St Alphonsus Liguori could at once preach in the church and hear confessions in his house.⁴ "That wonderful gift," says the biographer of St Francis di Girolamo, "which authentic testimony proves several saints to have possessed, namely, the power of being present in more than one place at times between which no physical interval is perceptible, was not denied to our saint."⁵ St John Joseph of the Cross was no less highly favoured.⁶ It was well for society that these holy persons never could have any wicked reason for wishing to prove an *alibi*, for nothing could have been more easy for them in any case. We need not wonder that saints who could occasionally be in two places at once, or pass from one place to another "with the velocity of blessed spirits," were also sometimes seen lifted above the ground; which seems to have now and then happened to them.⁷ We are also told what sweet perfumes their bodies exhaled, especially after they had received the sacrament, and how they were surrounded with halos of light.⁸ We know not how it came to be known that the fire

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, 152-154. See also p. 102, &c., concerning St Francis di Girolamo.

² Ibid., 154, 155.

³ Ibid., 214-216.

⁴ Ibid., 26.

⁵ Ibid., 102. The philosophic or scientific refinement in the statement of the thing is here very remarkable, and may very probably be referred to the editorial care of Dr Wiseman, who, as all the world knows, loves to connect religion with science and philosophy.

⁶ Ibid., 150.

⁷ Ibid., 27, &c.

⁸ Ibid., 145, 150, 165, 226.

was that of charity, but we may plainly read, and Cardinal Wiseman authenticates the story, that "the fire of heavenly charity produced a physical effect" upon a certain saint, "shooting sparkles of real light from his eyes; and so great was the warmth excited in his body, that he never approached the fire in the coldest winters, but kept his window open to moderate the heat which inwardly burned within his breast."¹ We are told of the perfection of one saint after another, a "Christian perfection," which was continued in them "from their first to their latest breath;"² the future sanctity of an infant being foreshadowed by her refusing to take nourishment, "save a small quantity in the morning and the evening," on Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday, "which the Church keeps as days of penance."³ Their perfection, however, was not maintained without some effort, for they had temptations, and we are particularly told how the devil made noises to disturb St Veronica Giuliani,⁴ nay put her into a frozen bath, in which she was held for several hours,⁵—a thing very trying, it may be thought, according to the physical theory above mentioned, to the ardour of her charity. They were not without reward, however, for their sufferings and virtues; and, for example, we read of a pair of shoes wonderfully ornamented with jewels for St Veronica Giuliani, who having in her childhood signalled her charity by giving away her pair of new shoes to a pilgrim, "Our Lady appeared soon after to her, with the shoes in her hand, shining with rich jewels, and told her, that in the person of the pilgrim she had received them, and her Divine Son had adorned them in that manner."⁶

It may surely be deemed unnecessary to have recourse for stories of miracles to the Life of St Rose of Lima, or any other

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 193.

² Ibid., 119, 141, 176.

⁴ Ibid., 239.

³ Ibid., 225.

⁵ Ibid., 245.

⁶ Ibid., p. 227. The last part of this story is so horrible to any mind really affected with reverence and love to Christ, that I hesitated whether I should quote it, or deal with it as with the passages most remarkable for filthiness in the pages of Dens and Liguori.

in Father Faber's volumes. That of Cardinal Wiseman contains enough.

The subject of the Espousals of Saints is a very odious one; but it is very essential to a proper view of this part of Popery. We have a specimen in the volume which has already supplied us with so many marvels. It will be borne in mind that every nun, or female self-devoted to perpetual virginity, is represented as the spouse of Christ. It is in the lives of female saints that we are to look for tales of their espousals. The narrative in the Life of St Veronica Giuliani thus begins:—

"The sacred Scriptures use the word *espousals* to denote a more intimate union, formed between God and the soul by the most perfect love. In the book of Canticles the Holy Ghost describes the correspondence of a soul with grace, under the figure of two spouses; and in the New Testament, our Lord speaks of the virgins whom he admits to his heavenly marriage-feast. THIS SPIRITUAL UNION WITH CERTAIN DEVOUT SOULS GOD HAS BEEN PLEASED TO MAKE MANIFEST TO THEM BY SENSIBLE SIGNS, ACCOMPANIED BY FORMALITIES LIKE THOSE USED IN ORDINARY MARRIAGES."

This last assertion is followed up by the narrative itself, of which it may be enough to extract the following sentences:—

"On the Feast of the Annunciation, our blessed Lady was pleased to prepare her for her espousals. This was by an intellectual vision, as she calls such in her writings, wherein she beheld the great Queen of Angels upon a magnificent throne, accompanied by St Catharine of Sienna and St Rose of Lima. To their prayer that she would consent to the espousals of her servant with her Divine Son, our Lady sweetly replied, that they should be brought about.² Veronica saw in her hands a beautiful ring, intended, as she was told, for her."³

The description of the "mystic ceremony" is continued through several pages, and we are told how the ring was put upon the woman's finger, and how it remained on her finger, and what it was like, and how it was seen by the nuns several times,

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, pp. 250, 251. (I have introduced the capitals.)

² Does this represent the Virgin Mary as an intercessor or as a goddess? It surely equals the "*Monstra te esse matrem*" of the hymn "*Ave maris stella!*"

³ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 252.

"and sister Mary Spaciani attests that she saw it once, during her noviciate, distinctly with her own eyes."¹ Again it seems needless to turn to any of Mr Butler's or Mr Faber's volumes, Cardinal Wiseman's volume containing enough—though he who is curious may find, in the *Life of St Rose of Lima*, a chapter headed "Jesus Christ espouses the blessed Rose, in the presence of the ever-blessed Virgin," and there also he will read of a nuptial ring, with something moreover of a "mysterious black and white butterfly."²

We might turn from volume to volume, and accumulate such stories of miracles and espousals. The saints of the Popish calendar are not few in number, and cart-loads of books have been published to declare their works and glories. It is one of the uses to which Popery has turned the art of printing, making it serve not for the elevation but the degradation of the human mind.

Papists seem to delight in naming their multitudinous heavenly patrons and helpers, and some of their litanies exhibit very strikingly this feature of their religion. Thus, in one litany, besides three invocations of Mary, as "Holy Mary," "Holy Mother of God," and "Holy Virgin of Virgins," the following angels and saints are expressed by name, and severally invoked to become intercessors:—St Michael, St Gabriel, St Raphael, St John Baptist, St Joseph, St Peter, St Paul, St Andrew, St James, St John, St Thomas, St James (again), St Philip, St Bartholomew, St Matthew, St Simon, St Thaddeus, St Matthias, St Barnabas, St Luke, St Mark, St Stephen, St Lawrence, St Vincent, St Fabian and St Sebastian, St John and St Paul, St Cosmas and St Damian, St Gervase and St Protase, St Silvester, St Gregory, St Ambrose, St Augustin, St Jerom, St Martin, St Nicolas, St Antony, St Benedict, St Bernard, St Dominic, St Francis, St Mary Magdalene, St Agatha, St Lucy, St Agnes, St Cecily, St Catharine, St Anastasia, besides general invocations skilfully introduced for variety's sake, of all the holy angels and arch-

¹ *Lives of Saints* of 26th May 1839, p. 256.

² *Life of St Rose of Lima*, chap. viii.

angels, all the holy orders of blessed spirits, all the holy patriarchs and prophets, all the holy virgins and widows, &c., &c.;¹ and such a litany as this is not only used in public worship, but is recommended to be said in Catholic families every evening.²

It is to be remarked that some of the names in this and other litanies are coupled together. It would seem that the saints like to be so invoked. The analogy is obvious to the Castor and Pollux of the old mythology.

The style in which saints are addressed by those who more specially invoke them may be seen from the following specimen, taken from the Litany of St Winefrid:—

"O blessed St Winefrid, pray for us,
O humble and mild Virgin, pray for us,
O glorious spouse of Christ, pray for us."

And so on, the "Pray for us" being appended to each of the following titles in succession,—Devout and charitable virgin,—Sweet comforter of the afflicted,—Singular example of chastity,—Radiant star,—Fairest flower of the British nation,—Admirable and elected vessel,—Mirror of chastity,—Mirror of devotion,—Mirror of piety,—Bright lamp of sanctity,—Golden image of angelic purity,—Hope and safety of distressed pilgrims.³

The number of the saints is continually increasing; new canonizations taking place, and new peers being added to the court of heaven. And perhaps it may be interesting, ere we lay aside Cardinal Wiseman's volume with which we have for some time been principally occupied, to pay a little attention to the account which he gives us of this important matter in his editorial introduction.

With the historical account of canonization we need not much concern ourselves. It may be quite true that canonization had its origin in the honours—undue honours—paid to martyrs in the early ages of the Church. A Protestant, admitting this, can

¹ Husenbeth's *Missal* for the use of the Laity, 376-379.

² *Key of Heaven*, 48.

³ Gahan's *Cath. Piety*, 226.

see in it only the working of the mystery of iniquity, and an illustration of the propensity which is in the human heart to idolatry. But our author begins far back when he tells us that "in the apostolic age we have an exact description of the practice followed by the Church after the death of St Ignatius and St Polycarp."¹ It is only with considerable latitude in the use of terms that the death either of Ignatius or of Polycarp can be said to have taken place within the apostolic age, and although such latitude is no doubt very convenient for the purposes of the Popish argument, yet it may not unnaturally excite a suspicion as to the fairness with which the argument is conducted.

Cardinal Wiseman is very careful to assure his readers that saints are not hastily canonized, nor without sufficient investigation of their claims. Every case (it seems) comes, in the way of a fair trial, before the *Congregation of Rites*, which was established by Pope Sixtus V. in 1587,—and then before the *General Consistory*, composed of all the Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops at the Court of Rome. Then are many formalities and many officials, and *remissorial letters* to bishops in the neighbourhood of the place where the *processes* are to be compiled, containing the proofs of miracles, and of the possession of "the theological and cardinal virtues in an heroic degree," and when these *processes* are opened at Rome, we are required to observe that "witnesses are called to prove the genuineness of the seals and signatures attached to them."²

It is worthy of observation however, that before the Congregation of Rites "proceeds to examine the virtues and miracles in detail," *fifty years* must have elapsed "since the death of the servant of God,"—a very fitting time perhaps for obtaining evidence of recent miracles wrought by his relics, but it is hard to conceive on what principle it can be deemed more proper that fifty years should elapse before the inquiry into his virtues.³

The number of officials and of formalities is easily accounted for. The Committee of the *Catholic Institute* in London, by

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, Introd., v.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

their secretary Mr Smith,—in a letter to Sir Culling Eardley Smith, intended to refute his allegation that "in 1842 the Pope had received upwards of L.10,000 from the King of Naples to make a certain woman a saint,"—explain the matter thus, "If the services of barristers, attorneys, and law-stationers, are in requisition, they must be remunerated; and if there are to be grand ceremonies, the necessary expenses must be paid." In a subsequent letter, Mr Smith says, "I informed you, that all the expenses down to the last farthing, were regulated by a published scale of fees, exactly similar to *Palmer's Book of Costs*, by which legal fees in Westminster Hall are regulated. I referred you to authorities for this, and made you know that L.10,000, the sum you allege to have been paid as a bribe, is almost exactly the same as the sum payable for these universally recognized and legitimate expenses."¹ The secretary of the Catholic Institute no doubt thought all this quite suitable for the purpose of his controversy. I find it equally appropriate for mine. The Congregation of Rites, with its reporters and prothonotary and secretary, and the promoter and subpromoter of the faith, consultants, auditors of the rota, advocates, physicians, surgeons, archivist, "and interpreters of the processes, if they happen to be written in a foreign idiom,"² are maintained at the expense of the King of Naples and others who are willing to part with money, in order to obtain for their countries or neighbourhoods the honour and benefit of an additional saint.

There has been considerable discussion amongst theologians of the Church of Rome, as to the possibility or impossibility of an error after all in the canonization of a saint. It cannot be a matter of little consequence, certainly, upon Popish principles, whether the claim be admitted or rejected. And this remains at last with the Pope, for though he can decide no case of himself until the appointed number of votes by Cardinals and others have been given in its favour, yet it lies with him to pronounce

¹ See the letters in Sir C. E. Smith's pamphlet "The Romanism of Italy." (London, 1845.)

² Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, Introd., x.

the decision, approving or disapproving the *virtues* which have been the subject of examination.¹ This decision would need to be infallible, as otherwise men might either be led to pray to a saint who was no saint, or deprived of the help which they might obtain by devoutly calling upon some "radiant star," or "elected vessel," or "bright lamp of sanctity," or "mirror of chastity" highly exalted in heaven.

And here occurs the question, Why the benefit of such devotions should be denied to the faithful for so long a time after the saint has departed to another world. Reasons of convenience it is easy to see for the existing arrangement, on the supposition that the whole system is one of imposture, but it is not easy to imagine any good reason upon any other supposition.

On the other hand, a reflection is suggested as to the vast advantage of these later times over times long past when saints were comparatively few. Was it because of the greater difficulty of finding one to undertake the task that none of the apostles has mentioned to us the name of his patron saint?

"But to proceed with the subject of canonization. The concluding ceremony is described in Cardinal Wiseman's volume with a minuteness which shews that no small importance is attached to it. The procession includes all the secular and regular clergy of Rome, and the whole thing having been really pre-arranged and determined, a solemn farce is enacted of petitioning the Pope, of prayer to heaven, and of announcement on the part of the Pope that he is now satisfied that God approves the request. The style in which the petition is addressed to the Pope is remarkable. "The most reverend Cardinal N., here present, *earnestly, (instantly)*, petitions your Holiness to enrol among Christ's saints, &c., N. N."² Then there is prayer, not only to God, but to the Virgin and other saints, and after some other forms the petition is repeated, "The most reverend Cardinal N., &c., *earnestly and more earnestly, (instantly et instantius)*, petitions your Holiness," &c. And ere this almost incredible mummary is completed, the petition has to be made a third time,

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, Introd., xii.

² Ibid., xviii.

"*earnestly, more earnestly, and most earnestly, (instantly, instantius, instantissime)*."¹

In the procession on this great occasion, "the standards of the new saints are carried!"² And Cardinal Wiseman tells us, with evident enthusiasm and delight, that when the canonisation is completed and the Pope intones the *Te Deum*—(that ancient and noble hymn, so often most profanely misapplied)—"at the same moment the sound of trumpets and the bells of the basilica announce the joyous intelligence to the city, which is echoed and re-echoed by the sound of drums, the thunders of artillery from the castle, and the pealing of the bells of the Capitol and of every church in Rome, which continue ringing for the space of an hour."³

The *offerings* made for each saint are singular.

"Two large wax-candles of forty-five pounds weight each, beautifully decorated with the effigies of the saint, are carried by two attendants of the cardinal-bishop, who follows them. A smaller taper, and a cage, containing two pigeons, are borne by a postulator of the cause," . . . &c., &c., &c. "Two loaves, one gilded, the other silvered, with the armorial bearings of the pontiff represented upon them, are carried upon two dishes, of wood, silvered. . . . Two barrels of wine, one gilded, the other silvered," . . . &c., &c."⁴

The reader naturally asks, What can be the meaning of all this? Let us hear Cardinal Wiseman on the loaves; it will suffice as a specimen.

"The early Christians offered bread for the sacrifice and for the use of the priests. Bread is the support of life. In acknowledgment to God for this good gift, the shewbread was kept, according to some authors, among the Jews. Melchisedech's offering was of thanksgiving for victory. Thus, in the present instance, it may be considered as a thanksgiving to God on the part of the Church for the acquisition of so many new heroes, protectors, and models."⁵

And this is to explain and account for the *two loaves, one gilded, the other silvered, with the armorial bearings, &c. &c.!!* In the same style the other offerings are explained. Let it be remembered, that although these "grand ceremonies" are not in Britain but in Rome, the description and explanation of them

¹ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, Introd., xix.

³ Ibid., xxi.

⁴ Ibid., xxiii.

² Ibid., xvi.

⁵ Ibid., xxvi.

are published in our own country, and by Cardinal Wiseman himself.

But the great object of Popish idolatry is the Virgin Mary. She is exalted above the other saints. Whilst to ward off the accusation of idolatry, it is pretended that they are only worshipped with *doulia* and not with *latria*, the worship proper to God alone, to her *hyperdoulia* is allowed. But, in fact, she has been exalted as an object of confidence above Jesus Christ the Mediator. "*In order that our most merciful God may the more readily incline his ear to our prayers, and may grant that which we implore,*" says the present Pope in his Encyclical Letter of 1846, "*let us ever have recourse to the intercession of the Most Holy Mother of God, the Immaculate Virgin Mary, our sweetest mother, our mediatrix, our advocate, our surest hope and firmest reliance, than whose patronage nothing is more potent, nothing more effectual with God.*"¹ It would seem as if this language were purposely intended to exalt her mediation above the mediation of Jesus, nay to renounce his in favour of hers; and there is here no word of her mediation with him (a common form, however, of Popish error respecting her), but an unqualified and unquestionable reference to her direct mediation with God. But Pius IX. only trod in the footsteps of his predecessors. Gregory XVI., in his Encyclical Letter of 1832, unequivocally exalts the Virgin as a goddess. "*We hasten unto you, Venerable Brethren, and as a sign of our good-will towards you, we address this letter to you, on this most joyful day, when we solemnize the festival of the triumphal Assumption of the Holy Virgin into heaven, that she whom we have acknowledged as our patroness and deliverer amongst the greatest calamities, may propitiously assist us while we write, and by her celestial inspiration may guide us to such counsels as may be most salutary to the Christian Church.*"²

¹ Encyclical Letter of our Most Holy Lord Pius the Ninth, by Divine Providence, Pope, to all Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops. (London, Dolman.)

² Quoted in Palmer's Letters, 7.

It is the Virgin, rather than God or Christ, who has become the object of adoration to multitudes within the pale of the Church of Rome. And even in our own country there is no part of Popish superstition of which so much that is monstrous is prominently brought forward,—sometimes, apparently, in blind unconsciousness of its true character, and sometimes through a too accurate perception of its congeniality to the mental condition of sentimental worldlings, and of its adaptation to inflame the souls of persons who never felt the glow of genuine piety.

It is thus that Mr Keenan in his Controversial Catechism begins his chapter "On the veneration of the ever-blessed mother of Jesus:"—

"Do Catholics adore the Blessed Virgin Mary as they adore God?—No, this would be idolatry; but Catholics honour her pre-eminent prerogatives with a degree of veneration *infinitely inferior* to that which is due to God, but much *superior* to that which is due to the angels and saints."¹

The question, however, is not so much about the veneration which is *due* to God, but about that which is actually *paid* to God; and, in respect of this, the *infinite inferiority* which Mr Keenan speaks of is by no means apparent. Advancing to the reasons for that peculiar honour which he supposes due to the Virgin Mary, Mr Keenan founds upon the text John xii. 26, "If any man serve me, him will my Father honour," an argument to prove that she ought to be regarded with veneration, and in order to give this argument the greater force, he assumes, without the trouble of proof, that no one ever served Christ with so great fidelity. But it does not appear how the honour to which the true servant of Christ is exalted by God is, even in its highest degrees, of a kind to confer a title to *veneration* or any sort of worship, although no Protestant can scruple to admit that every inhabitant of heaven is to be thought of with respect and esteem, and that the highest claim to respect and esteem which any fellow-mortal can acquire upon the earth, is that which is acquired by the service of Christ. There is in fact in

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., ch. xiv., sect. 1.

Mr Keenan's argument a little play upon two meanings of the word *veneration*. But, sensible that his first argument does not sufficiently establish the Virgin Mary's claim to "our especial veneration," our author goes on to point out other things which prove her "especially pre-eminent."

"Immediately after the fall of man, the Almighty honours her by pointing her out, four thousand years before the event, as the person whose seed should crush the serpent's head. In Isaiah vii. 13, she is made again the subject of a prophecy, and the sacred lips of the prophet of the Lord proclaim her virginity—a virtue which in all ages has obtained the first degree of honour."

The connection betwixt all this and *doulia*, or *veneration*, or any other *kind* of respect than is due to every servant of Christ, is left to conjecture, or rather it is absurdly taken for granted; and the argument, moreover, is founded upon assumptions equally gratuitous concerning the interpretation both of Gen. iii. 15, and of Is. viii. 14, of which last text the application here made is positively ridiculous. But it contains the word *Virgin*, and instead of suggesting to a Popish mind the mystery of the incarnation, it suggests only reveries about the super-eminent virtue of virginity and the perpetual virginity of Mary.

However, as is usual with Popish writers, Mr Keenan finds his great argument in what is called the *Angelical Salutation*, "Hail! full of grace; the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women."¹ Having quoted this (which I give in his own way, according to the translation contended for by Papists, and without staying to discuss the signification of *κεχαριτωμενη*), he proceeds to ask, "What think you of those Protestants who call the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?" Again he avails himself of two senses of a word, and thence derives an argument in which he seems to delight. There is one sense in which no sane man could ever think of affirming that the mother of Jesus was an *ordinary* woman. That she was called to very extraordinary duties, trials, and privileges, and that she was endowed with more than an ordinary degree of grace, piety, and holiness,

¹ Luke i. 28.—"Hail, thou that art highly favoured!"—*Eng. Trans.*

is most readily admitted by Protestants. Nor do we need Popish doctors to tell us that we ought to think of her with sentiments corresponding to these circumstances and endowments. But when she is represented as having been free from actual, nay even from original sin, and without taint of natural corruption; and when we hear her extolled as the Queen of Heaven, and as having authority over her glorified Son, we shudder at the blasphemy, and maintain her to be merely an *ordinary* woman, in respect of her personal attributes, her need and her enjoyment of salvation. This being premised,—which obviates the necessity of all other reply to much that Mr Keenan and others of his class are accustomed to say upon this theme, and exhibits them as the mere performers of a stale but odious trick,—let us bestow our thoughts for a moment upon the style in which they go about it.

"What think you of those Protestants who call the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?—We pity them, we tremble for them. An archangel, bearing the words of the Adorable Trinity upon his tongue, tells them they are blasphemers of the saints of God. They utter a falsehood in the face of that exalted creature, a falsehood in the face of the angel, nay a falsehood in the face of God himself."¹

With what audacity this man ascribes his own thought to the "Archangel," nay to the Adorable Trinity! How horrible and disgusting the use which he makes of the name of God! It is proper to remark that there is nothing of all this in Scheffmacher, who indeed does not devote any portion of his Catechism to the subject of the honour due to the Virgin Mary as distinct from the other saints, seeming to have felt that it was a dangerous topic for controversy. And Scheffmacher's Catechism is composed throughout in a style more decent—more what might be expected from a man of some measure of learning and cultivation of mind, as the Strasburg professor certainly was. Mr Keenan's improvements on the catechism may probably be held as illustrating the quality of the education given in Maynooth, and the sort of mental cultivation there attained, in which point of view

¹ Keenan, Controv. Cat., *ut supra*.

they are not uninteresting.¹ It may be therefore proper to add another specimen.

"What should Protestants do to justify their language towards the Mother of God? They should corrupt their Bible a little more, and make the angel say, '*Hail, thou that art an ordinary woman; thou hast no grace; thou art not blessed more than others; the Lord is as much with the wives and daughters of the holy reforming ministers as he is with thee.*'"²

Further specimens are needless, and equally needless is it to examine further into the arguments which are clothed with this monstrous garb, and which the author continues to multiply in his next section, with no variation of their nature, the pivot, upon which all is made to turn, being still the words "*ordinary woman*," and the declamation being freshened and invigorated by their perpetual repetition.

In a third and concluding section Mr Keenan tries another line of argument, adducing testimonies from "St Augustine," "St Epiphanius," and "the Greek schismatical Church." But by and bye he recurs to his favourite theme, and supplies his Popish readers with the considerations and even with the words which they may use in order to bring Protestants "to their senses," and "to make them blush" for their conduct in refusing to venerate the Virgin Mother. Here he also makes an experiment in the use of a somewhat different style, and endeavours to present an affecting view of the relationship of Mary to Jesus during the days of his humiliation,—a theme on which many Popish writers delight to expatiate, but which, though unquestionably interesting in itself, is full of danger to persons

¹ The only other class of writers of whom I know anything, who adopt a style at all similar to that of which an example is given above, are the *Morrisonians*, from some of whose publications much of the same offensive character might easily be extracted.

² In the same strain also Mr Keenan writes, in his treatise on the Veneration and Invocation of Saints, &c. :—"Hide your heads from the Deputy of the Creator, you who talk of the blessed Mary with disrespect, you especially, pretended ministers of the Gospel, who delude your followers by impressing on their minds that she was only an *ordinary woman*!!"—*Cat. of Chr. Rel.*, II., 281.

of susceptible and imaginative temperament, if any false notion of the glory of Mary has obtained a lodgment in their souls, and is too frequently employed to bring them more completely under the spell and the enchantment of idolatry.

Mr Keenan has another question in this section, the answer to which presents a common Popish argument in a very complete and simple form :—

"Is the veneration of the Blessed Virgin an ancient practice in the Church?—It can owe its origin only to the Apostles, for it can be traced to no later age; no man, no body of men, no country, can be pointed out as having originated it; hence it is evidently apostolical, and, consequently, it has the authority of heaven."

This is precisely the same argument which Popish authors in general, and the most approved of them, bring forward on this point; and it is substantially the same argument which they bring forward on a number of other points. Now without inquiring into the dates which have been assigned to the various superstitions connected with the worship of the Virgin, or into the evidence by which these dates are shewn to be certainly or probably correct, it may be stated in general, that as we trace back the history of the Church we come to dates beyond which the grossest opinions and practices cannot be shewn even to have existed, much less to have prevailed. But it must be admitted that this idolatry is not of recent origin, and that even in the writings of some of those who are called the Fathers of the Church, we find no indistinct traces of superstitious reverence for the Virgin. It is too evident that even in what is generally designated the Primitive Church, there was no small amount of error on this point, both in opinion and in practice. It is worthy of consideration, however, that the higher we ascend the stream the purer do the waters become, and the writers who lived near the times of the apostles, never express themselves as did those of subsequent centuries. The Reformers, and especially those of the Church of England, were very

¹ Keenan, *Controv. Cat.*, ch. xvi., sect. 3.

careful in collecting, from the primitive Fathers, testimonies adverse to the Popish doctrines and practices on this and other points, and there can be no doubt that they were successful in adducing many passages from their writings clearly and decidedly opposed to Popery,—but it is equally true, that their Popish antagonists were able to present in reply no small number of passages as decidedly inconsistent with pure Protestantism. But as opposed to the Mariolatry of the present Popish Church, even the absence of frequent mention of the Virgin in the writings of the earlier Fathers, is no insignificant fact. Our dependence, however, is not upon the history of the Church, nor upon the writings of the Fathers;—it is upon the Word of God, the inspired writings of the Apostles and prophets themselves. And there we find not only what we require for condemnation of the Popish veneration of the Virgin, but an explanation of the very facts of Church history which Papists endeavour to turn to so much account in their argument. Even the apostolical Church was not perfectly pure; and how could any reader of the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians have ever imagined that it was? In the very days of the Apostles, the corrupt leaven had already begun to manifest its tendencies. What then if Papists could succeed in tracing back their veneration of the Virgin to the very days of the Apostles,—so as to find some indications of it even then? And what if these indications do begin to appear very shortly after? It is one of the strangest arguments which ever men propounded or put in shape, and we ought to thank Mr Keenan for presenting it so simply and so undisguised,—that because an opinion or practice can be traced to the apostolic age, therefore it is to be referred to the Apostles. Indeed, if it could be proved to have prevailed unchanged, and to have pervaded the whole Church and all its rites and institutions from the first, the case would be different. But the evidence is all of an opposite tendency; and all that Mr Keenan ventures to allege is, that no man, no body of men, no country, can be pointed out as having originated the veneration of the Virgin;—this veneration of the Virgin being, however, just

such a thing as both in the minds of men, and in its outward forms and demonstrations, might most naturally be supposed to grow by slow degrees and from the most imperceptible beginnings,—to all which we must shut our eyes, and take for granted that it must needs have been instituted all at once; and if we cannot say by whom else it was originated, Mr Keenan tells us that we must ascribe it to the Apostles, and so without more trouble he finds for it “the authority of heaven.” The steps are wide, in this process of reasoning.

It remains only to notice the question and answer, interesting upon another account, with which Mr Keenan concludes his chapter on the veneration of the Virgin:—

“What should Catholics do in a country where torrents of blasphemous insults are every day poured forth against the Mother of God by men calling themselves Christian Ministers?—They should have ever on their lips the sweet address of the Archangel-deputy, thus paraphrased by the holy Athanasius fourteen hundred years ago: ‘Be mindful of us, O blessed Virgin! Hail, full of grace, the Lord is with thee! Thee the angelic and terrestrial hierarchies proclaim blessed. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. O mistress, lady, intercede for us! Queen, and Mother of God, pray for us!’”

It must be confessed that this, whoever made it, is a pretty free paraphrase, and makes the Archangel-deputy say a good many things of which there is no hint in the words recorded by Luke. It is a convenient way of finding authority for the invocation of the Virgin,—for the whole *doulia* at least,—and, moreover, for the monstrous appellation *Mother of God*, which until this close of his chapter, Mr Keenan has been careful not to use. But at all events, who can refrain from admiring the meek and gentle spirit which is here exhibited? The “Catholics” are to use no weapons more cruel than the sweet address of the Archangel-deputy, thus admirably paraphrased! What wonder that so many liberal Protestants in these days have become quite satisfied that there is no longer any danger of the employment of pincers, racks, thumb-screws, stakes, faggots, and all the other implements by which the refractory were brought to their

senses, and insults against the "Catholic" religion were avenged in the days of old ! And yet it is the same religion, and its zealous maintainers could express themselves as sweetly and benevolently in these old days as now. Nay, if history err not, there were instances enough of the greatest sweetness and seeming benevolence being succeeded very speedily, when circumstances had only changed so as to present a favourable opportunity, by all the horrors and atrocities of persecution. Perhaps it would be well for liberal Protestants to think again ere they trust the words of men who endeavour to palm off their own idolatrous fancies as proceeding in substance, if not in language, from the lips of an Archangel.

It is unquestionable that the worship of the Virgin has long occupied a most important place in the Popish system as practised by Papists,—that devotional books full of praises and prayers addressed to her, have for many centuries been circulated and used, and have enjoyed the sanction of the highest authorities of the Popish Church,—that every Papist who counts his beads is taught to address himself ten times to the Virgin for once that he addresses himself to God,—and that from time to time the honour of the Virgin has been extolled anew by writers and preachers who have found this their pathway to popularity, whilst new outbursts of fervour towards her have increased the power of the priesthood in Popish lands. Yet we find many of the Popish controversialists of last century rather avoiding the subject. Scheffmacher's Catechism mentions the Virgin only in general terms, along with the other saints. Mr Keenan introduces a chapter, branching out into three sections, on her peculiar excellencies and the devotion of which she is the object. There is scarcely more mention of her in Milner's End of Controversy than in Scheffmacher's Catechism. Bishop Challoner is less reserved and cautious, and in his Catholic Christian Instructed we find the following information concerning "the days observed by the Church in honour of our Lady the Blessed Virgin Mary :"—

"Besides her Purification and Annunciation, we keep the day of her

Conception, Dec. 8 ; the day of her birth or Nativity, Sept. 8 ; and the day of her happy passage to eternity, Aug. 15, which we call her Assumption, it being a pious tradition that she was taken up to heaven both body and soul. We also keep the day of her Presentation, or consecration to God in the temple, Nov. 21 ; and of her Visitation, Aug. 2 ; but these are not holidays of obligation."¹

Bishop Challoner also makes free use of the title Mother of God, and endeavours to justify it in the way usual amongst Papists, by saying that she is the mother of him who in one and the same person is true God and true man, and "consequently she is truly the mother of God," though "not by being mother of the divinity ;" and with the air of one who is ready to adduce the high authority of Scripture, he adds, "Hence she is called by St Elizabeth, Luke i., *the mother of my Lord*,"—the argument from this text being no better than if he had said, "Because St Elizabeth did not call her the Mother of God, we Papists do."² He anxiously maintains, however, that there is a reference to Christ in all the honour given to his mother, for "whatever honour the Church gives the mother, she refers it," he tells us, "to the glory of the Son, as the chief motive and end of all her devotions." This is in truth merely one of those subtle and fallacious distinctions by which Papists attempt, like the ancient Pagans and the philosophic Brahmins of India, to vindicate their idolatry and to represent it as essentially a worship of the true God. This futile distinction is afterwards employed by the same author to vindicate the repetition of the *Hail Mary* "in the Beads," so much oftener than the Lord's Prayer. "The Church," he says, "in honouring the mother has principally in view the honouring of the Son,"—a thing so far from being obvious that it certainly required to be stated. "And if withal" he concludes, "it [the *Hail Mary*] begs the prayers of the Blessed Virgin, it is plain that he is

¹ Challoner, Cath. Christian Instructed, chap. xxiii.

² In Kenrick's "Month of Mary," p. xii. will be found a *Prayer of St Bernard*, in which the Virgin Mary is addressed as "MOTHER OF THE ETERNAL WORD."

more honoured, to whom we desire she should address her prayers, than she whom we only desire to pray for us." The argument is ingenious, and sounds pretty well: but we have more to consider than a mere "Pray for us," and it is hard to believe that the Lord Jesus Christ is more honoured than the Virgin Mary in prayers in which she is supplicated to lay her commands as a mother upon her son.¹ There is an absolute denial of Christ in "Open to us the gate of mercy, O Holy Mother of God."²

But to exhibit the present aspect of Popery in this country in what relates to the worship of the Virgin Mary, it is not enough to quote from works like those to which our attention has hitherto been directed. There is another class of works, an importation and adaptation of the worst Mariolatry of the continent: and whilst these are sometimes published in a form to suit the humblest purchasers, they may be seen also decked out in a way to recommend them for the table of the drawing-room. To this class belongs "The Glory of Mary, in conformity with the word of God; By James Augustine Stothert, Missionary Apostolic in the Eastern district of Scotland,"³—a book, shining like a dragon-fly, in all the attractions of blue and gold. To this class also belongs "The New Month of Mary, or Reflections for each day of the month, on the different titles applied to the Holy Mother of God, in the Litany of Loretto; principally designed for the month of May,"⁴ By the Very Rev. P. R. Kenrick,⁵ a work of American authorship, but reprinted in this country. With these must be mentioned "The Glories of Mary, translated

¹ As "*Jure matris impera redemptori.*"

² Kenrick's *Month of Mary*, (Dolman, London, 1848) 134.

³ Dolman, London: no date.

⁴ "The devotion of the faithful towards the Mother of God has inspired them to consecrate the month of May in a special manner to her honour. This pious practice originated in Italy," &c. (Preface.)

⁵ Dolman, London, 1848.—This also has a frontispiece, representing Mary above the clouds and amongst the stars, with the infant Jesus in her arms; his arms being so stretched out as to produce something like the figure of a cross!

from the Italian of St Alphonsus de Liguori,"¹ the work from which others of this class are generally in great part derived, the grand repertory and storehouse of everything pertaining to this idolatry, which has recently been given to the British public by the Redemptorist Fathers of St Mary's, Clapham, at a price so small as to indicate a willingness even to expend money for its circulation, and an expectation that the cause of Popery is to be promoted thereby. On the back of the title-page it contains an approbation and recommendation by Cardinal Wiseman, besides exhibiting his coat of arms, surmounted by the hat.²

On looking into any of these works, the idolatrous worship of the Virgin so presents itself that the only difficulty which can be felt is that of selecting the instances and illustrations. The "Litany of the Blessed Virgin," or "Litany of Loretto," which supplies Father Kenrick with his themes, contains invocations of the Virgin Mary under the titles Holy Mary,—Holy Mother of God,—Holy Virgin of virgins,—Mother of Christ,—Mother of divine grace,—Mother most pure,—Mother most chaste,—Mother undefiled,—Mother unviolated,—Mother most amiable,—Mother most admirable,—Mother of our Creator,—Mother of our Redeemer,—Virgin most prudent,—Virgin most venerable,—Virgin most renowned,—Virgin most powerful,—Virgin most merciful,—Virgin most faithful,—Mirror of justice,—Seat of wisdom,—Cause of our joy,—Spiritual vessel,—Vessel of honour,—Vessel of singular devotion,—Mystical rose,—Tower of David,—Tower of ivory,—House of gold,—Ark of the covenant,—Gate of Heaven,—Morning star,—Health of the weak,—Refuge of sinners,—Comforter of the afflicted,—Help of Christians,—Queen of angels,—Queen of patriarchs,—Queen of prophets,—Queen of apostles,—Queen of martyrs,—Queen of confessors,—Queen of virgins, and Queen of all saints!—The reader is pro-

¹ London, 1852.

² It bears to be "given at Westminster, on the feast of Saint Alphonsus de Liguori, A.D. 1852," and the signature (with the usual cross prefixed) is "NICHOLAS CARDINAL WISEMAN, ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER."

bably wearied,—that is, if he has really attempted to read the formidable enumeration,—but what would he think of a whole volume on these themes? But the poor Papist must labour through this Litany as a part of his devotions, and he is advised to betake himself during the month of May to daily meditation on these titles.

And what sort of meditations may be suitable to such themes? I shall refrain from quoting any of them, or of the illustrative stories connected with them,¹ in order to find room for two or three specimens of practical directions and devout aspirations, and of the perverted application to Mary of texts of Scripture appropriate to God or Christ.

“Conceive a great devotion to the name of Mary; pronounce it reverently, and ever accompany your invocation of the adorable Jesus with a devout aspiration to Mary, his most Holy Mother.”²

“May thy name, O Mother of God, be the last sound that escapes my lips.”³

“Through thee do our prayers ascend to God; and by thy means do his faithful servants enter on their eternal rest.”⁴

“O glorious Queen! despise not my petitions; accept of my homage, my veneration, and my love. I commend myself to thy most powerful protection, and dedicate to thee what I am and what I have. On thee do I found my hope, &c.”⁵

“‘In thy hands are power and might.’ 1 Paralip. xxix. 12,” (i.e., 1 Chron. xxix. 12).⁶—In connection with the title “Virgin most powerful.”

“‘This is the gate of the Lord; the just shall enter into it.’ Psalm cxvii. 20,” (i.e., Ps. cxviii. 20).⁷—In connection with the title “Gate of Heaven.”

“‘I am the root and stock of David, the bright and morning star.’ Apoc. xxii. 16.”—In connection with the title “Morning Star.”⁸

“As the eyes of the handmaid are turned towards her mistress, so are my eyes turned to thee, O Holy Mother of God.”⁹

It may well be deemed impossible to find anything worse than these specimens even in the Popery of Spain and Italy. But it is for America and for Britain that the work is designed,

¹ The following words of the first story may shew how credible and rational they are:—“So great was his purity that he did not even know the name of the contrary vice.”

² Kenrick's Month of Mary, p. 6.

³ Ibid., p. 7.

⁴ Ibid., p. 133.

⁵ Ibid., p. 195.

⁶ Ibid., p. 67.

⁷ Ibid., p. 129.

⁸ Ibid., p. 134.

⁹ Ibid., p. 140.

in which scriptural expressions of homage and devotion to God and to his Christ are thus impiously perverted to this idolatrous application. There is rather more of it, although nothing worse, in some of the Italian books; as, for example, in a little volume now before me, throughout which the author's audacity represents Jesus as speaking to the soul of the worshipper of Mary, whilst corresponding prayers and ejaculations are set down for the worshipper to use,—and amongst the ejaculations are these:—“When shall I come and appear before Mary?”¹—“I will sing of the mercies of Mary for ever;”²—“Speak, Lady, because thy son heareth;”³—“In thee, Lady, have I hoped, I shall not be confounded for ever;”⁴—“I am thine, save me, O Virgin Mary;”⁵—“Into thy hands, O Lady, I commend my body and my spirit.”⁶

Neither in one part of the world nor in another, neither in Rome, nor in New York, nor in London have Papists yet become ashamed of Bonaventure and his Psalter, but are still ready to avail themselves of the labours of that Saint and seraphic Doctor, as he has been termed, who “so wrote on divine subjects,” said Pope Sixtus IV., “that the Holy Spirit seems to have spoken in him,”⁷ and by whom every one of the psalms was transformed so as to accommodate it to the worship of the Virgin instead of the worship of God.⁸ Nay, Bonaventure is commended by Liguori because he “did so much to make the glories of Mary known,”⁹ and that in the work so strongly stamped with the approbation of Cardinal Wiseman.

Liguori's work on the Glories of Mary begins with “the author's prayer to Jesus and Mary.” The style of the prayer is

¹ Gesu' al cuore del divoto di Maria considerazioni di un sacerdote Barnabita. (Torino, 1845,) p. 30. ² Ibid., p. 35. ³ Ibid., p. 54.

⁴ Ibid., p. 88.

⁵ Ibid., p. 92.

⁶ Ibid., p. 97.

⁷ Tyler on the Worship of the Virgin, p. 27.

⁸ “Blessed is he who loveth thy name, O Virgin Mary,” his first psalm begins, “thy grace shall comfort his soul.” And in the same psalm he contrives to introduce the praise of the Virgin's supereminent personal beauty, “Universas enim foeminas vincis pulchritudine carnis.” The whole of this horrible production may be seen in Chemnitzii Examen. Conc. Trid.

⁹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, p. 6.

as singular as its matter. Jesus is first addressed. His love to his mother, and the delight he takes in seeing her honoured, are declared, and the author's resolution therefore adopted concerning the publication of his book. Then, in a familiar, easy sort of way, most marvellous and most revolting, the saint says,—“*I know not, however, to whom I could better recommend it than to Thee, who hast her glory so much at heart. To Thee, therefore, do I dedicate and commend it.*”¹ The introduction commences thus,—“*My beloved reader and brother in Mary!*”² In it is quoted with approbation the saying of Bonaventure, “that those who make a point of announcing to others the glories of Mary are certain of heaven;” and a story is told of a Dominican friar, “who always concluded his sermons by speaking of her, when on his deathbed this blessed Virgin defended him from the devils, consoled him, and then she herself carried off his happy soul.”³ The doctrine is laid down, which a chapter of the work is occupied to prove, “that all graces are dispensed by Mary, and that all who are saved are saved only by the means of this Divine Mother.” But perhaps the most shocking thing of all to a reader whose mind is not debased by this polluting idolatry is at the close. “Let us then both say, devout reader, with the pious Alphonsus Rodriguez, ‘Jesus and Mary, MY MOST SWEET LOVES, for you may I suffer, for you may I die; grant that I may be in all things yours and in nothing mine.’”⁴ This hideous familiarity Cardinal Wiseman must be regarded as approving and seeking to promote in Britain. It abounds in Liguori's work. I can scarcely venture to make quotations, and yet I must. There is a prayer beginning,—

“O Lady, O ravisher of hearts! will I exclaim with St Bonaventure: O Lady, who with the love and favour thou shewest thy servants dost ravish their hearts, ravish also my miserable heart, which desires ardently to love thee. Thou, my Mother, hast enamoured a God with thy beauty. . . .”⁵

Again, in another prayer,—

¹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, p. 1. ² Ibid., p. 5. ³ Ibid., pp. 6, 7.

⁴ Ibid., p. 9. Ibid., p. 41.

“O most beautiful Mary! O most amiable Mary! thou hast gained the heart of God; take also my poor heart and make me a saint!”¹

Can anything be conceived more horrible?

It may be some relief to the reader to turn from these to a specimen of a very different kind, but no doubt quite congenial and harmonious. It needs no preface. It is from a chapter, “Of the sweetness of the name of Mary during life and at death.”

“It is narrated in the life of the Rev. Father Juvenal Ancina, Bishop of Saluzzo, that in pronouncing the name of Mary he tasted so great and sensible a sweetness, that, after doing so, HE LICKED HIS LIPS.”²

More stories of the same kind follow; and then, with perfect gravity, Saint Alphonsus Liguori goes on to say, “But here I do not intend to speak of that sensible sweetness, for it is not granted to all.”

But turning, for the present, from this book and its impieties, its innumerable perversions of Scripture, and its multitude of lying legends and miserable puerilities, let us bestow a little examination upon Mr Stothert's work on the Glory of Mary, which may not unfitly be regarded as intended to prepare the way for this of Liguori, any advancement beyond which is really inconceivable. Liguori's work is evidently intended for Papists alone, and for those of them whose souls are most deeply enslaved, whilst Mr Stothert assiduously and sometimes adroitly endeavours to adapt himself to a state of mind which Protestantism engenders even in those who are farthest from the real religion which gives it all its power, and which cannot but be supposed to infect many Papists also who live in Protestant lands. He assumes an air of liberality, and speaks as if, contrary to all the pretensions of the Church of Rome, he included Protestants in *the Christian world*.³ He bethinks himself that “the principal facts

¹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, p. 581.

² Ibid., p. 220. Will Cardinal Wiseman venture to tell this in one of his next lectures?

³ Stothert's Glory of Mary, p. vii. In like manner Mr Keenan, amidst his utterances of intensest bitterness and low reviling, can affectionately exclaim “Dear Protestant Christians!”—(Keenan on the Veneration and Invocation of Saints, Angels, and the Blessed Virgin, p. 42.)

of the case" respecting the Virgin, "as represented by one party, are in all essential particulars undisputed by the other,"¹ and that they are preserved in a volume which all agree in receiving and venerating as divinely inspired, as the repository of unerring truth."² Nothing can seem fairer than this, and when the author proceeds to make an unhesitating appeal to the pages of the Old and New Testaments, he shews himself well skilled how to disarm the opposition of many who know too little about the Protestantism in which they have been educated, although they have imbibed the opinion that the Holy Scriptures are the fountain of religious knowledge and repository of all sacred truth, and who are very readily staggered by such apparent admissions of the authority of the Word of God. He is too cautious, however, to commit himself to an admission of the supreme authority of Scripture, contrary to the real tenets of his Church, and employs language which means less than the reader might be apt to suppose. He seems, indeed, a little at a loss how to express himself at once strongly enough and cautiously enough. "Scripture," he admits, "may not say of Mary all that is said of her by Catholics,"³ but he maintains that all they say is fully justified by Scripture; and ere long he reminds the reader that there is not only a *written*, but "also an *unwritten* word, whose sacred depositary is also the only authorised and unerring interpreter of what is written."⁴ He does not indeed think it proper to bring forward so prominently in the meantime the argument from the "unwritten word,"—that is, the traditions of the Church;—but he insinuates that Protestants do not know what they are about in their summary rejection of it, and endeavours to prepare them for favourably entertaining it. It is interesting to observe how he represents himself as lying under a serious disadvantage in the conduct of his Scriptural argument, "from the extreme familiarity of the popular mind in Scotland with the language of the sacred volume," a familiarity which he obviously much dislikes, and in the mention of which he allows a little of

¹ Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, p. vii.

³ *Ibid.*, p. viii.

² *Ibid.*, p. vii.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. x.

his Popish feeling with reference to the word of God to break out, shewing an anxiety which he does not express, to have it more estranged from the hands and minds of the people. "Its effect," he says, "is to weaken the force of inspired language as an evidence of doctrine. The eye glides over the words of Scripture, cursorily, from long acquaintance with them; or they fall upon the ear, unheeded, without conveying any definite or lasting impression to the mind. Language, which, if met with for the first time in a new and respected author, would be justly admitted as conclusive, suggests nothing when extracted from the worn-out pages of Scripture, confirms nothing, proves nothing."¹ From which the conclusion is obvious, that it were better for us all in this Protestant country if the *pages of holy Scripture* were less *worn-out*, and that the reading of it so much does harm rather than good. Popery is still the same; it hates the Bible and Bible circulation, and we would have fewer arguments from the *written word*, if men were not already familiar with it, and if the *unwritten word* might be received.

Mr Stothert's first chapter is devoted to the examination of what he calls Preliminary Difficulties, and these are doubts as to the perpetual virginity of Mary, objections to the title Mother of God, and apprehensions lest the honours given her should confound her glory with that of the Creator. For "how," he asks, "could any one be expected to examine dispassionately the proofs for the immaculate conception of Mary, who had a lingering impression that she was not ever a virgin,"—though what connection there is betwixt these two things he does not think fit to inform us,—"how, calmly weigh the evidence that would prove her to be the first of creatures, or the channel of grace, if he called in question that she is the Mother of God?"²

Enough has perhaps already been said of that uncouth, monstrous, and offensive designation, Mother of God. Mr Stothert's arguments are substantially the same that have been already noticed. As to the notion of Mary's perpetual virginity, it is not requisite that much time or attention should be given to it.

¹ Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, p. xii.

² *Ibid.*, p. 1.

Papists make ingenious use of certain texts of Scripture, and shew considerable skill in critically examining them, to make out that they do not prove the opposite to this notion. But in truth, the Popish argument on this subject requires for its basis the previous admission of a Popish principle, respecting the excellence of virginity, which has no place in the moral law of the Bible.

This is a subject which Protestants in general do not feel to be attractive, and on which it appears to them singular that Papists should so delight to dwell! We shall not therefore follow Mr Stothert in his inquiry concerning the opinion "widely maintained," and to which he concludes by giving his fullest assent, "that Mary had purposed in her heart, before the angel visited her, to remain ever a virgin."¹ But it is impossible to read even his remarks on this part of his subject, without perceiving that under the garb of the most delicate phraseology, is concealed much of essential indelicacy, and without apprehending that all the recommendation of celestial virginity, and many of the attempts to reach it amongst Papists, may really tend to pollute the imaginations of those who seem farthest removed from the danger of contamination in any other way.

The very litanies contain many references to this subject, and it is most offensively brought forward in other parts of the liturgies of the Church of Rome. "The blessed Mary, ever Virgin," are words of frequent occurrence. They meet us, for example, in the very commencement of the Ordinary of the Mass, in the form of confession of sins. But such an expression, complete in meaning as it certainly is, was insufficient for minds loving to dwell and expatiate upon the subject. Accordingly, we find the following amongst the devotions addressed to the Virgin:—"After child-birth thou didst remain a virgin," and "Whilst a virgin thou didst bring forth God and man, and after child-birth didst remain a spotless virgin."² And these, and things simi-

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, p. 2.

² Husenbeth's Missal for the Use of the Laity, lxviii.

lar, are repeated again and again,¹—nay, worse and grosser expressions, which I forbear from quoting.²

Returning to Mr Stothert's book, we find him maintaining a general argument in the outset, to prove that Mary is "justly honoured." Here he speaks of the limits set by the Church to the honour which she teaches her children to pay to Mary, as restraining them only from giving her the honour due to God. But these, he says, "are the only limits within which she would circumscribe their overflowing love, homage, and admiration in regard to the Blessed Mother of her Lord."³ He maintains, of course, that the security is sufficient against this love, homage, and admiration overflowing the limits which he alleges that the Church has set; yet he admits that were we to "separate the devout practices of the Catholic Church in regard to Mary from its dogmatic teaching," there "might be serious grounds for entertaining such a fear" as Protestants are accustomed to express upon this point.⁴ It is an important admission, and suggests the question so often and variously suggested, Which is the most effective way of teaching, the dogmatic or the practical? Which is likely to make the deepest, the most abiding, or the most general impression? or which is likely to be the most operative in the minds of ignorant boors, of young and giddy girls, or of the large classes of persons who are not accustomed to close or serious thought? Moreover, it is too evident that a large amount of this dogmatic teaching is to be ascribed to Protestant opposition.⁵

¹ Husenbeth softens a little when he translates "*Beata viscera Mariæ Virginis*," "Blessed is the womb of the Virgin Mary." (Husenbeth's Missal for the Use of the Laity, lxix., &c.) But this is not the worst.

² It may be interesting to the reader to know that the bush which Moses saw burning and not consumed is explained as typifying the "virginal maternity" of Mary. (Kenrick's Month of Mary, 32.) And this is also embodied in the liturgical *antiphon*, "*Rubum quem viderat Moyses incombustum, conservatam agnovimus tuam laudabilem virginitatem: Dei Genetrix intercede pro nobis.*"

³ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 25.

⁴ Ibid., 21.

⁵ In arguing from Luke i. 28, from the words of the angel, "Hail! full

Besides the usual Popish arguments in favour of the worship of Mary, Mr Stothert borrows one from Newman's work on *Developement*. It is one of those ingenious subtleties by which Jesuitism labours to entangle and perplex the mind. "If the honour that we pay to Mary is such as is due to God alone, then the Arians, who paid far higher honour to Christ, were unjustly condemned. But if they were fairly convicted of refusing divine honour to Christ, then we do not offer it to Mary; for our homage to her falls very far short of the dignity which they ascribed to Christ. In other words; the Arians were condemned, because underneath their ascription of high-sounding titles to Christ, there lurked a denial of his divinity, in the fatal assertion that he was, after all, only a creature of God. For the very same reason we ought not to be condemned, because, under far inferior titles of honour, ascribed by us to Mary, there remains the unquestioned fact, that she was a creature of God; the first,

of grace," or as it is in our Protestant Bibles, "Hail! thou that art highly favoured," Mr Stothert represents these versions as of substantially the same signification, referring for this purpose to the use of the same Greek word, *χαριτω*, in Ephes. i. 6. Here he differs remarkably from Mr Keenan, who condemns the Protestant translation in very strong terms. But their objects were somewhat different.—It may not be out of place to say, that Mr Stothert's reference to Ephes. i. 6 has a singular bearing upon his argument, to which he seems totally blind. The argument runs thus:—"When the archangel proclaimed her 'full of grace,' we believe that he announced the truth, that the soul and body of the Holy Virgin were indeed filled with grace to the utmost limit of created capacity; and, as a necessary consequence, that the fulness of her glory corresponds to the plenitude of grace that she received on earth. So that among created beings, she is alone without an equal; God only is above her." (Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, 25, 26.) But in the place quoted,—Ephes. i. 6,—we find the Apostle making use of the same word with respect to many, saying, "Wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved;" or as it is in the Popish version, "In which he hath graced us in his beloved Son." So that all those with respect to whom the word is used, would, according to Mr Stothert's argument, be "filled with grace to the utmost limit of created capacity," and each of them would be alone without an equal amongst created beings, and so forth,—the argument, in fact, plunging its author into the depths of absurdity.

indeed, and most glorious, but no more than a creature still."¹

But here it is obvious enough that the whole argument depends upon the assumption that the homage paid by Catholics to Mary, falls very far short of the dignity which the Arians ascribed to Christ,—an assumption not agreeable to truth. Moreover, although the homage ostensibly rendered by the Arians to Christ was not what was really due to him as divine, yet it was far beyond what could properly be given to any creature; and such homage rendered to a creature draws forth the soul to further and grosser idolatry. And the whole question is falsely stated. For really it is not whether Papists pay to Mary all the honour which is due to God, but whether they pay to her any honour such as is due to him alone.

But now we come to a chapter on "Mary in Prophecy." Of course, we have the common argument from Gen. iii. 15,—the text however being quoted according to the incorrect reading of the Vulgate, "*She* shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for *her* heel,"—a reading which even Papists do not adopt without hesitation, as may be seen from the note in the Douay Bible. And accordingly Mr Stothert afterwards mentions the variation, "'*It*,' i.e., the seed of the woman, 'shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise *his* heel,'" which he admits, "has the support of considerable authority, even of some copies of the Vulgate;" but, following the guidance of the above-mentioned note of the Douay Bible, he goes on to say, "The obvious meaning, however, of either version is the same. The woman is clearly set forth in both, as the enemy whom God was to raise up against the devil; in both, her seed is to oppose the devil's seed," &c.² By this simple process of declaring it to be obvious, Mr Stothert establishes the very important point, that the *woman*, and not the seed of the woman, is here set forth as the *enemy* whom God was to *raise* up against the devil; and nothing can be more pitiful than the argument

¹ Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, 23.

² *Ibid.*, 35.

by which he then proceeds to shew that the woman in this text is not Eve, *because the enmity spoken of was still future.*

"Who is the woman, whom so great an office awaited? Not Eve, certainly; for the devil had already vanquished her, the enmity between them was an existing, not a future thing; God was not its author, but the devil; he was her enemy already, and something more, he was her conqueror. Whereas the enmity predicted was then a thing to come; something that as yet was not; and which God himself would call into being and establish, for the confusion and overthrow of the devil."

It seems strange that men should condescend to such puerilities, or that men should be deceived by them,—if indeed, they were intended for men, and if the whole work were not purposely framed for the weakest of under nursery-maids, and boarding-school girls.

But most extraordinary are the assumptions and arguments founded on this text, by which Popery appears to recommend itself in a peculiar manner to the female sex. The devil "had made the weakness of a woman his prey; God gave him a woman for his *enemy and conqueror*," says Mr Stothert.¹ And then follows a reference to 1 Cor. i. 27, which is quoted at full length, about the weak things of the world confounding the strong, &c., and a long quotation from the book of Judges about the ignominious death of Abimelech! From all which it appears that Christ must not have the undivided honour of spoiling the principalities and powers of darkness, or of conquering and destroying him that had the power of death. The conqueror is "a woman"—or rather "the woman"—"the woman above all other women, who, by pursuing to extremity the hostility that God should establish between the devil and herself, should be superior to all men and women."² "It was fitting that a woman alone, without the aid of man, should destroy their common enemy, and restore all things."³ This surely is the apostasy complete. A woman the conqueror!—the destroyer of the devil!—the restorer of all things!—and *without the aid of man!* Where then is the work—where is the glory of Christ?

But Mr Stothert, who in all this is not at all singular, ex-

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 30.

² Ibid., 33.

³ Ibid., 32.

tiates on this theme of the Virgin's victory being achieved without the aid of man, and refers to the miraculous conception of the seed of the woman as illustrating this characteristic of *her* victory! How often he repeats this sentiment, and with what variety of expression, the reader of his work must be left to discover for himself. But by and bye we find Jesus spoken of as overcoming the enemy of the human race, "not however without her [the Virgin's] co-operation, inasmuch as his existence as a man is derived from her."¹ And "she is the woman above all women, whom God hath made the enemy and the conqueror of the devil and his seed, through her *co-operation* with himself in their final overthrow."² Nay, "when the triumphant cross of the Son of Mary shall have been set as a seal for ever on the gates of the bottomless pit, then it shall be said that the head of the serpent hath been crushed *by the hand of a woman*."³ Quite a different thing is said in the ninety-eighth Psalm:—"O sing a new song to the Lord; for HE hath done marvellous things: HIS right hand and HIS holy arm hath gotten him the victory."⁴

In another part of his book Mr Stothert says, that Mary should be regarded as having "prolonged and multiplied the labours of Christ's life and death, through eighteen centuries and over the whole world,"—that till the final destruction of the deceiver and his seed, the woman and her seed must coexist as the divinely appointed agents of that destruction," and that "Mary is regarded by the Church as the centre of a living energy."⁵

A parallel betwixt Eve and Mary is frequently attempted by Popish authors. "She was the counterpart of Eve," says the translator of Liguori's Glories of Mary,—

"and co-operated in our salvation as Eve had co-operated in our eternal death. We have seen that our Lord himself gave her to us as our Mother and Advocate, through whom we are to receive all graces. And finally, that in her all things are restored; for she is the new paradise, the

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 39.

quotations are not Mr Stothert's.

⁵ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 114-121.

² Ibid., 40. The italics in these

³ Ibid., 41.

⁴ Ps. xcvi. 1.

'enclosed garden,' in which grew that fruit of life of which we are commanded to eat."¹

But the most extraordinary means are used to exalt the glory of Mary. To her is applied the glorious passage in the eighth chapter of the book of Proverbs, as if she were the Wisdom whom "the Lord possessed in the beginning of his way, before his works of old."² In respect of a passage in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus,³ evidently an imitation of this, in which are the words "From the beginning, and before the world was I created," Mr Stothert, who interprets it of Mary, argues that although it cannot "be said, in a literal sense, that Mary 'was created from the beginning before the world,'" yet "in the eternal purpose of God, in whom all time is present, there is perfect propriety in saying that she existed from the beginning,"⁴—an argument from which it would equally follow that the same assertion might be made respecting Mr Stothert himself, or any other human or inferior creature. Surely when men are imposed upon by such arguments, they unconsciously illustrate that text, "God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."⁵

Mr Stothert's third chapter is headed, "Mary in her Conception, Immaculate." He informs us that—

"There is a pious opinion, universally diffused through the Church of God, that this supreme privilege was reserved for the blessed Mother of the Redeemer, that she should be not only born but conceived without sin. An opinion,"—

he goes on to say,—

"because it has not yet been defined as a part of revealed truth, however much in harmony it seems with the whole analogy of Christian doctrine; and however completely involved in it. Till the living interpreter of Divine Revelation has spoken, till the supreme Pontiff has proposed it in definite terms to our acceptance, its reception is not binding on the conscience of any one, as an article of faith, necessary to salvation."⁶

¹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, Translator's Preface.

² Proverbs viii. 22.—See Stothert's Glory of Mary, 45.

³ Ecclesiasticus, xxiv. 5 and 14.

⁴ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 44.

⁵ 2 Thess. ii. 11.

⁶ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 56.

It is this opinion which in this chapter Mr Stothert sets himself to maintain, admitting indeed that there have been Papists who have maintained the opposite, as he holds that they were entitled to do, whilst the Pope had not yet interposed his authority. But "since the Pontificate of Sixtus IV. it has been forbidden to teach or defend the contrary opinion, under pain of excommunication," and "the Council of Trent, in its decree regarding original sin, especially declares, that it is not its intention to include in that decree the Blessed and Immaculate Mary, Mother of God."¹ The Council's decree was not indeed so free from ambiguity as to prevent opposite interpretations; and the controversy about the conception of Mary has raged fiercely in the very bosom of the Popish Church. Mr Stothert too poetically says that "every whisper of opposition has silently died away."

Many Protestants supposed that the present Pope had finally determined the matter by his encyclical letter, dated from Gaeta, in February 1849, by which he sanctioned the adoption of the term Immaculate, as applied to the conception of the Virgin in the Roman office, "at the discretion of the bishops, throughout the whole Church;" but even here there was a relic of the same caution or cunning which guided the decree of the Council of Trent: and the whole Church, Mr Stothert says, having "lately, as it is understood, testified her reception of this opinion by the unanimous suffrage of her bishops; she is waiting for the decision of the Holy Father, firmly believing that through his lips the Divine Spirit himself will speak, and anticipating the time when another bright jewel shall be added to the crown of her beloved Queen, by the formal promulgation of this ancient opinion as an original part of revealed truth."² It might have been supposed, that if the Divine Spirit were to speak by the mouth of the "Holy Father," there would be no need of the suffrage of the bishops, nor of anything else than his simply giving forth that new revelation with which he was inspired.

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 68.

² Ibid., 68.

But let us glance at the process by which it is attempted in the meantime to persuade us that this *opinion* is "an original part of revealed truth." It is not merely an appeal to texts of Scripture which is made. The argument consists much of generalities. There must have been some peculiar excellence distinguishing the Virgin to fit her for what she was appointed to; and we are called to contemplate Jesus and Mary, as represented—

"in the immortal works of Christian art, which fix our attention and win our love, and melt our hearts to-day, as irresistibly as they attracted the admiration and elevated the devotion of generations of men long since passed away,—creations of the painter's spiritualized genius, in which a beauty all angelic is thrown around the holy maiden-mother, as the fittest expression of the sublime perfection of every grace to which she had been raised; while the tender loving child whom she caresses and adores, reveals glimpses of an intelligence unknown to infants of our race, giving assurance to our faith, that the Word has been made flesh, and has dwelt among us."

Alas! for the faith which derives its assurance from a mere beautiful painting. But thus the aid of imagination is called in, and an attempt is made to act upon the sensibility and to enlist the feelings;—and then we are told in effect that this is a subject not to be tried by hard and cold and severe argument.

"When we would measure her prerogatives, we must inquire not what she would have been by nature, as a daughter of sinful Eve; *nor even what she must have been, to fulfil the letter of revelation*; but what it was befitting the greatness and the holiness of God that his grace should make her, in order that she might become a worthy dwelling-place for himself."¹

And much more there is to the same purpose,—really this, that we should allow our fancies to run wild, and refuse to be bound in our opinions either by reason or the word of God.

Yet we have again appeals to Scripture, and an argument from the text, "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?"² an argument which if good and valid as to the Virgin, might obviously be carried back to the Virgin's mother

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 49-50.

² Job xiv., 4.

and to her mother's mother, and so to Eve herself. But here again we have a flood of declamations, and the text falls out of sight amidst generalities, issuing in the conclusion that the wisdom, power, and goodness of God alike forbid the thought of the Virgin's being no more than a common daughter of Eve.

Whereas the loss of original justice or righteousness, sustained by the fall, continues, according to the doctrine of the Church of Rome, to be endured by most human beings until they are baptized, after which comes sanctification,—there have been some, it seems, "more privileged amongst the saints," in whose case "God has anticipated their birth by restoring original justice to their souls, and sanctifying them, before they came into the world."¹ One of these was the prophet Jeremiah,—another was John the Baptist. The proof in Jeremiah's case is derived from the text, "The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the womb, I knew thee; and before thou camest out of the womb I sanctified thee, and made thee a prophet unto the nations,"²—a text of which the misinterpretation is almost ludicrous; the sanctification here being evidently, in the primary sense of the word, the setting apart to a holy service, according to a gracious purpose of personal election. But it being established that there were some who were sanctified before their birth, who of course were inferior in their mission to Mary, it follows that some higher privilege, some greater gift of sanctity must be hers. But what?

"There is one higher gift, and only one; if God shall by his grace anticipate not the birth only but the animation of the chosen infant, so that in the moment when the soul and body, yet unborn, are united, the taint of original impunity shall not touch them."³

But other proofs are adduced. For example we have an argument from the promise in Gen. iii., 15. "It cannot be supposed that God would permit her whom he had *so emphatically chosen as the final conqueror of the devil*, to be even for an instant his property and his slave, as an infant conceived in

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 54.

² Jer. i. 5.

³ Ibid., 55.

sin most undoubtedly is."¹ So that in one error, we have the foundation laid for another.—Then we have an argument from the practice of the Church. "Out of reverence for the unequalled dignity of Mary, as the mother of our Lord, the Church salutes her, among other titles, as the Queen of Angels."² But it is enough to have stated the foundation of the argument in this instance, it is unnecessary to follow it out.—We have also an argument, which is in fact a mere repetition in a new form of one already noticed, founded upon the assertion that "it was an integral part of her body" which God "took and moulded into the form of a man, and *made a part of his own divinity*,"³ where, as in expressions elsewhere occurring, the distinction seems to be destroyed betwixt the divine and human natures in Christ. But "how," it is asked, "could it be said of Christ that he was separated from sinners, if he derived an integral part of himself from substance that had ever known the infection of sin?" "'Not separated from sinners,'" it is profanely and absurdly added, would express the truth, if Mary was not conceived without sin."—And we have an argument from the application by the Church of the language of the Song of Solomon to the relation betwixt the Holy Spirit and the Virgin.⁴ This last argument is full of associations of blasphemy. Papists do not shrink from designating Mary the Spouse of the Holy Ghost. Thus in a publication already noticed, the "Little Crown in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, for the use of those who are invested with the Blue Scapular of the Immaculate Conception," we find the fol-

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 57.

² Ibid., 58.

³ Ibid., 60.

⁴ With what intolerable effrontery, after all this, is the assertion made, that the whole argument of this and the previous chapters is eminently *scriptural*. "Nor can any one have failed to remark how much the argument has hitherto turned on the language of holy Scripture; how uniform and clear has been the light thrown upon the object of this inquiry from its inspired page. 'Thy word, O Lord, is a lamp to my feet, a light to my path.' The conclusion has been established not by the 'learned words of human wisdom,' but by 'comparing spiritual things with spiritual.'" (Stothert's Glory of Mary, 70.)

lowing concluding sentence of a prayer, the whole previous part of which is addressed to the Virgin Mary:—

"And you, O HOLY GHOST, by the merits of these privileges, graciously hear the supplication of YOUR MOST BELOVED SPOUSE, and pardon us, *her devoted servants*."¹

Nor is this a singular and solitary instance. The following "*aspiration*" is to be found in Kenrick's New Month of Mary. It is ascribed to Simon Garcia.

"Hail, Daughter of God the Father! Hail, Mother of God the Son! Hail, SPOUSE OF THE HOLY GHOST! Hail, Temple of the Most Holy Trinity!"²

In Liguori's Glories of Mary, this most horrible blasphemy abounds. The reader will remember that it is not quoted as a mere exhibition of Italian Popery, but as a work forced into circulation in this country, and strongly recommended by our leading Papists, and in particular by Cardinal Wiseman. It was becoming, says Liguori, that God, and all the three divine persons should preserve Mary from original sin,—"*that the Father should preserve her as his daughter, the Son as his mother, and the Holy Ghost as his spouse*."³ And thus he proceeds to construct his argument in favour of the Immaculate Conception, dwelling upon each of these three points in succession. But I forbear from multiplying quotations. In conclusion I merely advert to an argument with which St Alphonsus Liguori concludes his chapter on the Immaculate Conception,—from miracles wrought by "*billets*," which it seems were in his day largely distributed, and it may be supposed still are, in the kingdom of Naples. I have not heard whether Cardinal Wiseman has a stock of them for London, or Bishop Gillis for Edinburgh. If St Alphonsus Liguori's stories are true, they

¹ Little Crown, &c., (Dublin, 1849), p. 7.

² Kenrick's New Month of Mary, 128. The *Uffizio della B. V. Maria* presents us with the following Antiphon, "*Maria virgo assumpta est ad æthereum thalamum, in quo Rex regum stellato sedet solio*." (p. 11.)

³ Liguori, Glories of Mary, 243.

might be of more use than many lectures. It seems to be enough to put a "billet of the Immaculate Conception" into a man's hand, and presently, however, resolute against everything of the kind before, he is seized with an irresistible desire to act the part of a good Catholic, and go to confession. The instances which St Alphonsus Liguori gives, are, he says, "truly admirable." It is enough here to indicate, as has just been done, the general purport of these stories. But the saint assures us that in this way,—that is, by means of these billets,—our Lord was daily pleased, in his time, to dispense throughout the kingdom of Naples, well-known, innumerable, and prodigious graces.¹

After the "Immaculate Conception" of Mary, Mr Stothert proceeds to treat of "Mary on Earth," and of the "Union and Co-operation of Jesus and Mary," and of "Mary Suffering." Of course, he exalts her above all saints and angels; for, as Kenrick also says, "Although Mary be a creature, she is infinitely superior to all other creatures: they are the servants of God; SHE IS HIS MOTHER."² Mr Stothert argues, that as she stands alone *between* God and man, in virtue of the relation of her substance to the Divine Person of Jesus Christ; and as it must be believed that she worthily filled that eminent position; she must possess richer and more abundant graces than the *whole race* which she *represents*.³ Here, to say nothing of the argument, in which premises, process, and conclusion are so worthy of each other,—it is to be observed that Mary is exalted above mankind to occupy *alone* a place *between* God and man, and is not only said to possess richer and more abundant grace than all mankind together, but to be the *representative* of the whole race. Under what covenant is this? And what now is Christ?

But "by the co-operation of Mary the work of redemption was brought about," says Mr Stothert.⁴ He gives a particular enumeration of the *Seven Dolours* of Mary, fantastically ima-

¹ Liguori's *Glories of Mary*, 266-268.

² Kenrick's *New Month of Mary*, 128.

³ Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, 71, 72.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 72.

gined and distinguished, which are commemorated by the Popish Church every year, and in honour of which a special festival is held. For,—

"She wept and suffered, and her children at the remembrance of her sorrow weep also; but from her woes and their cause, namely, the vicarious sufferings of Jesus, came our redemption; they purchased the final extinction of sin, the fountain of unnumbered griefs; they procured the advent of the Comforter, they opened for mourners a passage to the place of refreshment, where God wipeth away every tear from the eye."¹

And again,—

"It was sin that cost Mary all her sorrow, not her own, but ours. For our disobedience she painfully obeyed; for our wilful waywardness Jesus and Mary suffered more than the pains of natural death."²

As argument from Scripture is wanting here, its place is supplied by an argument of a more unfailing kind. "It is related of a young man who had a great devotion to the Dolours of the Holy Virgin,"—for these dolours somehow become a sort of separate deities,—"that he once had the misfortune to fall into mortal sin,"—*once*, only *once*, for he was a child of Mary!—

"He happened soon after to pass an altar where he usually knelt to pray before a picture, representing the heart of Mary pierced with seven swords. To his surprise he perceived eight instead of seven; and he immediately knew that his recent sin had added another wound to her blessed heart. He was touched with compunction, confessed his fault with many tears, and by the intercession of Mary was restored to Divine grace."³

Such are the stories which grave men are childish enough to believe! which the people of this country are seriously asked to believe!—stories worthy of the doctrines which they are employed as arguments to maintain.

From what has been quoted it appears very plainly, that according to the doctrine which Mr Stothert lays down, Mary is as much, or at least as really, entitled as Jesus to be called the Saviour or Redeemer of the world. Liguori does not hesi-

¹ Stothert's *Glory of Mary*, 129.

² *Ibid.*, 130.

³ *Ibid.*, 131.

tate to apply to her such titles as these,—“the Repairer of the human race,”—the Redeemer of captives,”—the Repairer of a lost world,”—and “our Liberator from our calamities.”¹ Concerning the sacrifice of the Cross, Mr Stothert says, “By the intimate and perfect union of her will with his, SHE OFFERED HIM THEN, to his Eternal Father, *for the sins of a lost world.*”² “At the death of Jesus,” says Liguori, “Mary united her will to that of her Son, so much that both offered one and the same sacrifice;” and he quotes with approbation the sentiment of Denis the Carthusian, “that THE DIVINE MOTHER CAN BE CALLED THE SAVIOUR OF THE WORLD, since by the pain she endured in commiserating her Son (willingly sacrificed to Divine justice), she merited that through her prayers the merits of the passion of the Redeemer should be communicated to men.”³ Consistently with this, all graces are represented as coming to men through the hands of Mary,⁴ and her intercession is declared to be necessary for salvation; although here comes in one of the most remarkable of all the subtle distinctions which Romish theologians have invented,—it is necessary, “not with an *absolute* necessity, for the mediation of Jesus Christ alone is absolutely necessary, but with a *moral* necessity, for the Church believes with St Bernard, that God has determined that no grace shall be granted otherwise than by the hands of Mary.”⁵

With all this is connected a very impious sentiment, that when it was *proposed* to Mary to become the mother of our Lord, “*a fallen world’s redemption hung suspended on an act of her*

¹ Liguori’s Glories of Mary, p. 43. He professes to quote all these from the Fathers, but every such quotation would require to be carefully examined ere it could be admitted. We can fall into no error in taking them as expressing his own and Cardinal Wiseman’s sentiments.

² Stothert’s Glory of Mary, 81.

³ Liguori’s Glories of Mary, 343, 344. The subject of the merits of Mary is one on which the writers on her glories enlarge to a great extent. Mr Stothert says, “she acquired new merit every moment of her life,” and Liguori has some very curious things on the rapidity of its accumulation.

⁴ See Stothert’s Glory of Mary, 164-167.

⁵ Liguori’s Glories of Mary, 129.

will, on a word from her lips;” and that “she was able to have refused, and, by refusing, to have thwarted the divine plans.”¹

Here also may be mentioned the high place which Papists assign to Mary as a witness to us of the Incarnation, without whose evidence we could know nothing of that truth, and therefore nothing of what is essential to Christianity. To the mystery of the Incarnation, says a writer in the Dublin Review,—

“God willed that there should be only one witness; of all its holiest details, one sole evidence. . . . This must stand attested to the world for ever by only one witness, and that was Mary ever blessed. . . . Now, first take away,” [he afterwards says,] “her contribution to the gospel testimony, efface her testimony to Christianity, and you find not simply a link broken, but the very fastening of the whole chain wanting; not merely a gap or a break made in the structure, but the foundation gone. . . . The belief in the wonders wrought in the Incarnation, of ages and of the world, rests upon one point of testimony, a unit, a single voice, that of the blessed Virgin Mary.”²

It is hardly necessary to remark that all this proceeds upon a completer assumption concerning the evidence of tradition than even Papists are accustomed to make when they discuss the Rule of Faith, a more entire rejection of Scripture,—the evidence which we have of the Incarnation being made to consist in a mere chain of human testimonies arising from the testimony of the Virgin. The maintenance of this view is evidently inconsistent with a recognition of the inspiration of the Bible. Nor could any means be devised of more completely giving up the cause of Christianity to the mercy of the infidel, than to make the evidence of the Incarnation depend upon the testimony of the Virgin Mary.

But to return to Mr Stothert. His chapter on “Mary’s De-

¹ Stothert’s Glory of Mary, 90. I think it needless to make similar quotations from Liguori. And I can only request the reader to consider whether this impiety, of which, indeed, I am not aware that any Morrisonian has been guilty, is not also the legitimate consequence of principles laid down by Morrisonians.

² Dublin Review, Dec. 1851. Article on the “Actions of the New Testament.”

cease and Assumption" may be described as a romance throughout. Its assertions are in general not even supported by any form of reference to Scripture. It begins with an effort of sentimentalism, which may not be without its influence over minds at once very weak and very imaginative. I shall quote the opening sentence:—

"It is with much significance that the Church celebrates the decease and assumption of the blessed Virgin in the month of August, the mature season of the year, when the fruits of long patience and culture are safe gathered in; when the anxieties of the husbandman are crowned with success; when those who went forth in spring weeping and casting their precious seed, come back with joy carrying their sheaves. It was a long and dreary spring time when Mary was suffering and weeping with her son," &c., &c.¹

This namby-pamby conceit is wrought out and expanded through a paragraph. Much that follows is in a similar strain. An attempt is made to work upon the imagination and feelings; and assertions are multiplied without the trouble of reference to any authority. We are told that when Jesus had risen from the grave, he "rewarded the singular faith of his Blessed Mother with the first sight of his glorified body,"²—that "she sat among the apostles as a queen,"³—that "she knelt on Mount Olivet to receive the parting benediction of her son," and "beheld him as he went up till his lessening form was hidden from her sight by the cloud through which he passed;"⁴—for all which it is easy to see why no reference is made to the Bible, notwithstanding the pretence which Mr Stothert makes in his title-page and introduction. And then follows what is intended to be a very affecting account of Mary's death, with only this unfortunate disadvantage, that we are not favoured with the slightest reason for thinking that there is a word of truth in it. It is contrasted with the death of her Son,—“she, upon her quiet couch,—untouched by pain,—full of peace and unnumbered joys,—with all heaven around her,—apostles and holy women beside her, offering her their reverence, and minister-

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 133.

² Ibid., 134.

³ Ibid., 134.

⁴ Ibid., 135.

ing as to a superior being."—"She tranquilly reposed, as an infant upon its mother's bosom,"—and poetic fancy having received full license to *put in* whatever it might please, "the breath of evening, that faintly stirred the lightest leaves of the palm, wafted into her chamber the delicious odours of flowers and distant 'gardens of spices;' the softest, roseate tints of autumn were shed upon her couch by the declining sun. A few parting words of kindness for the beloved disciple of Jesus, and her own adopted son; a few precious promises, asked and given, that she would not forget the infant Church of her Lord when she should see his face again," &c., &c., &c.¹ Then follows the assertion that "her holy virginal body remained fresh and young as when Gabriel first knelt before her,"² though *when* he knelt before her, we are not informed. But this about the freshness and youth of the holy virginal body, it is signified in a note, is only an "opinion" and "nothing more, like another and kindred one of her exemption from the pains of childbirth,"—that is to say, has not been authoritatively imposed by the Pope upon the faith of all the members of the Church. But both *opinions* rest upon the doctrine of the immaculate conception; for Mary being free from original sin, it is argued that "sickness, and pain, and age were likely to be strangers to her."³—And why not *dolours* then? it might be asked; but it is of no consequence. It is needless to tell how circumstantial an account is given of her funeral. But then we come to the *Assumption*. Three days after the funeral,—for the supplementary gospel is exact, (and why should it not?)—"a disciple from a distant part of the Church arrived," and it was granted to his importunity that he might have one look of the countenance of the holy Mother of the Lord. "And a company of Apostles and disciples repaired to her tomb, to gratify the wish of their devout brother. They opened it, and lo! it was empty, fresh flowers of exquisite colour and fragrance lay strewn within it." What incident have we at all analogous to this in

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 140.

² Ibid., 140.

³ Ibid., 140-141.

any Scripture narrative?—"But its beloved inhabitant was no longer there. Strains of celestial harmony floated over head; and no doubt remained that the pure immaculate body of Mary had been reunited to her soul, and that both had been assumed into the glory of the heavenly Jerusalem."¹ And this we find in a book which professes to deal with us Protestants on our own grounds of Scripture, and which is impudently entitled "The Glory of Mary in conformity with the word of God." The fables of Æsop have as much to do with the word of God.

But if we have not Scripture, we have, in this instance, argument. It begins however with an appeal to the feelings,—an appeal, by which Protestants in general may probably at first be more astonished than otherwise moved. "Is there a Christian heart that does not feel it to be necessary that Mary should escape the corruption of the grave?" And then the argument proceeds. "Or rather, is it possible to imagine that her body, of whose substance Christ was made man, could ever have been permitted to see corruption." And, adding to all this the doctrine of her immaculate conception, it concludes *in the highest degree of certainty* as to "some modification of the general law of death in her favour,"² and thus error is piled upon error, and the fancy and the reason of man invent and speculate together, illustrating by an example of the extremest kind the danger of going beyond the bounds of revelation in matters of religion. And again, it must be remarked that the argument here used concerning Mary might evidently be carried farther with similar propriety to her parents and their parents and so back:—whilst in our Lord's genealogy are names connected in the mind of every reader of the Bible with gross and heinous sins,—the names, for example, of Judah and David, of Rachab and Thamar:—a fact not unimportant as pointing out our Lord to the chief of sinners in the character of a Kinsman Redeemer.

But it is not enough to make sure of Mary's *assumption* by such evidence and argument as have just been exhibited. The

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 142.

² Ibid., 142, 143.

Scripture history of our Lord's ascension ceases when he is received out of the sight of his disciples: but the unscriptural history of Mary's assumption could not be allowed to stop short in the same way and to omit anything that might be interesting. It begins, as Mr Stothert has given it, with a sentence from Scripture, but it is a sentence merely adapted from a narrative of a very different nature, and has nothing to do with the subject to which it is applied.

"And the king arose to meet her; and bowed to her, and sat down upon his throne, and a throne was set for the king's mother, and she sat on his right hand? And upon her brow he placed the crown of universal dominion; and the countless multitudes of the heavenly hosts saluted her as Queen of heaven and earth."¹

But Mr Stothert is moderate in his demands on our credulity. His story of the Assumption is briefly told. Not so that of St Alphonsus Liguori, whom Cardinal Wiseman and he agree in recommending. It seems proper to give a few specimens, but unnecessary to make any remarks upon them.

"Let us now consider how our Saviour went forth from heaven to meet his mother. On first meeting her, and to console her, He said, '*Arise, make haste, my love, my dove, my beautiful one, and come. For winter is now past and gone. Come, my own dear mother, my pure and beautiful dove, leave that valley of tears, in which, for my love, thou hast suffered so much,*' &c., &c. . . . But see, Jesus offers her his hand, and the Blessed Mother already ascends; already she has passed beyond the clouds, beyond the spheres. Behold her already at the gates of heaven. When monarchs make their solemn entry into their kingdoms, they do not pass through the gates of the capital; for they are removed to make way for them on this occasion. Hence, when Jesus Christ entered paradise, the angels cried out: '*Lift up your gates, O ye princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates, and the King of Glory shall enter in.*' Thus also, now that Mary goes to take possession of the kingdom of heaven, the angels who accompany her cry out to those within; '*Lift up your gates, O ye princes, and be ye lifted up, O eternal gates; and the Queen of Glory shall enter in.*' All the saints who were in paradise then came to welcome her, and salute her as their Queen. All the holy virgins came: *The daughters saw her and declared*

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 146.

her most blessed, and they praised her. 'We,' they said, 'O most blessed Lady, are also queens in this kingdom, but thou art our Queen, . . . &c. Then came the holy confessors, . . . &c. The holy martyrs also came, . . . &c. Saint James, the only one of the Apostles who was yet in heaven, also came to thank her in the name of all the other apostles, for all the comfort and help she had afforded them while she was on earth. The prophets next came to salute her, . . . &c. The holy patriarchs then came, . . . &c. But amongst these latter came our first parents, Adam and Eve, to thank her with still greater affection. 'Ah beloved daughter,' they said, 'thou hast repaired the injury which we inflicted on the human race; thou hast obtained for the world that blessing which we lost by our crime: by thee we are saved, and for it be ever blessed.'—Saint Simeon then came to kiss her feet, . . . &c., &c., &c., &c.¹

It seems as if there were no end to this romancing. But Cardinal Wiseman, of course, believes all this, for he recommends it all to our acceptance. For one other specimen of his religion, ere we lay aside the book, let us borrow, from his favourite saint, the "example," which for the encouragement of the faithful, concludes the discourse on the Assumption.

"Father Silvano Razzi relates, that a devout ecclesiastic, and tender lover of our Queen Mary, having heard her beauty greatly extolled, had a most ardent desire once to see his Lady; and therefore, with humble prayers, begged this favour. The clement mother sent him word by an angel, that she would gratify him, by allowing him to see her, but on this condition, that after seeing her he should remain blind. He accepted the condition. Behold, one day the Blessed Virgin appeared to him; but that he might not remain quite blind, he at first wished to look at her with one eye only; but afterwards overcome by the great beauty of Mary, he wished to contemplate her with both, whereupon the Mother of God disappeared. Grieved at having lost the presence of his Queen, he could not cease weeping, not indeed for his lost eye, but because he had not seen her with both. He then began to entreat her again, that she would once more appear to him, being quite willing for this purpose to lose the other eye, and become blind. 'Happy and contented shall I be, Oh my Lady!' he said, 'to become wholly blind for so good a cause, which will leave me more than ever enamoured of thee, and of thy beauty.' Mary was graciously pleased once more to satisfy him, and again consoled him with her presence; but because this loving Queen can never injure any one, she not only did not

¹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, 366-369.

deprive him of the sight of the other eye but even restored him the one he had lost."¹

These are fair samples of the contents of this extraordinary Popish book, so much lauded and authoritatively recommended, a *cloaca maxima* whose contents the Popish ecclesiastics of this country are now most anxious to pour down our throats.

Mr Stothert likewise exhibits a few illustrations of the benefit arising from "confidence in Mary's influence." He is pleased however to call his illustrations *historic*, and to choose such as relate to the Church rather than to individuals. The first of them is the suppression of the Nestorian heresy. The connection of Mary's name with this portion of ecclesiastical history, is sufficiently well known, but what her power or influence had to do with it, is not equally *historic*.—The next example is the triumph of the Church over the Albigenses, of whom we are told the same tales which every Popish priest seems to feel it necessary to repeat, of their Manicheism and their rebellion against civil government,—the charge of Manicheism resting entirely upon the testimony of their enemies, with whom it originated, perhaps partly in misapprehension, and partly in malice; whilst that of rebellion resolves itself, as in so many other alleged cases, into the most necessary self defence, nay, is capable of being most successfully retorted, for the Popish crusades were preached against persons living peaceably in due subjection to the civil government, and enjoying the support and countenance of their lawful rulers.²

"The watchful care of God," says Mr Stothert, "provided a new remedy for the evil. In the very country where this heresy prevailed most, he raised up a great saint, and inspired him with the thought of instituting a new method of devotion, in order to obtain the all-powerful assistance of heaven in this emergency. That saint was St Dominic, and the new method of devotion was the ROSARY. As Mary had been destined to be the perpetual enemy and the final conqueror of the devil, it was an obvious thought

¹ Liguori's Glories of Mary, 375, 376.

² This question of alleged Manicheism, and the character of the Waldenses and Albigenses, will come before us again in next chapter.

to turn to her, . . . &c., &c. The crisis passed over, the Albigenses melted away, *no one could say how*; peace and order ere long returned; Mary had triumphed."¹

Unparalleled ignorance or unparalleled impudence! "The Albigenses melted away, *no one could say how*!" Is the crusade blotted out of history? the sieges of Beziers and Carcassone? the devastation of the country? the treachery? the massacres? Is Simon de Montfort a myth? Surely none less honourable to human nature was ever invented. Did Dominic fight against the Albigenses with none but spiritual hosts, and none but spiritual weapons, including the *rosary*? Were there no dungeons,—no stakes and faggots,—no crucifixions,—no strange forms of death inflicted upon heretics? The man presumes too grossly on the ignorance of his readers, who coolly asserts that the Albigenses melted away, *no one could say how*; and proceeds to explain the mystery by ascribing it all to the rosary, and the confraternities organized for the practice of this new method of devotion.

The next example, given by Mr Stothert, of the benefit of confidence in Mary, is one of deliverance from Mahomedan invasion, and of victory granted to "the Christian force of Spain and Venice in the bay of Lepanto," on the 7th of October 1571,—in memory of which Pope Pius V. "instituted the festival of Saint Mary of Victory, the first Sunday in October, and inserted the invocation *Help of Christians* in the Litany," which festival has since been denominated, by like authority, the Festival of the Rosary."²—The last example is no other than Pio Nono's own glorious return from Gaeta, whither he made so inglorious a flight in the Bavarian Baron's carriage.

"But the exiled Pontiff had great confidence in the patronage of Mary; it was one of the fruits of his past experience. From his temporary retreat, he issued a remarkable invitation to the bishops of the Church, to co-operate with him in supplying what was wanting to a definition of fresh honours for her. Assistance was brought from an unexpected source;—*Mary had once more interposed*; and Pius IX. again sits on the throne of

his august predecessors in the Vatican. His first public act of thanksgiving was to decree the *promotion of the Festival of the Visitation to a higher rank*; for on that day 'the yoke of those who kept possession of the city of Rome had been shaken off.'"¹

"The promotion of the Festival of the Visitation to a higher rank!"—Rank and precedence amongst the festivals! An illustration of developement!—the growth of superstition. But it is well that Popery should exhibit all its grossness now. It is Popery in disguise that is dangerous,—Popery affecting to be spiritual and simple. It is well that Pius and his bishops should go on, devising new honours for Mary, and placing beyond all controversy, as a doctrine, the *opinion* of her immaculate conception.—But how are we to be assured of her interposition? We have no evidence of Scripture,—no evidence of miracle,—no evidence of any kind, unless the Pope's word be sufficient, which can scarcely be expected to convince Protestants. So instead of "Mary interposed," we shall rather read, "The French government interposed;" and instead of crediting the statement that Pius owes his possession of the Vatican to her influence, we shall continue to hold that there is more truth in the jest that his seat is upon the points of French bayonets.

Before we leave this part of the subject we must direct a few moments' attention to the Rosary. Here also Mr Stothert may guide us. He expatiates upon the Rosary. He tells how early the practice began of counting prayers by beads or little pebbles; he enlarges on the advantages of St Dominic's invention, by which the ancient practice was so much systematised and improved. The Rosary, it appears, comes in place of books to the unlearned, and even those who can read are still happy to use it. "The Church of God . . . was grateful for the beautiful gift that it had received through St Dominic."² "Circumstances make it sometimes impossible to use books of prayers. . . . At such times the devotion of the rosary recommends itself as an easily available method of prayer." Its excellence is "further enhanced by the numerous indulgences

¹Stothert's Glory of Mary, 177, 178. ²Ibid., 180.

¹Stothert's Glory of Mary, 182. ²Ibid., 178.

attached to its use, by many sovereign pontiffs."—"His rosary is very precious to every Catholic."—"If the secrets of many hearts could be revealed, the triumphs of the rosary, now, would bear comparison with those of former ages; Mary is still '*Our Lady of Victory*.'"¹

Pages are devoted to the subject of this "beautiful devotion." The following is one of the most remarkable paragraphs, and illustrates the mental condition engendered by Popery. Here we see that fearful saint, St Dominic himself, condescending to the most pitiful conceits, if aught indeed can be more pitiful than the employment of a mechanical aid to devotion, founded upon the idea of merit to be acquired, or favour with God to be attained by the repetition of a prescribed number of prayers.

"The Psalms have always been a favourite part of public and private devotion in the Church. The daily office said by the clergy and the religious orders is, in great part, composed of them. But it was at one time very difficult to get copies of them, before the invention of printing. Hence the thought was suggested to St Dominic to prepare a form of devotion that might represent the Psalms to those who could not read; and FOR THIS PURPOSE he made the Rosary consist of as many times Hail Mary as there are Psalms in the Psalter, that is of 150. For this reason it is sometimes called the Psalter of the Blessed Virgin."²

Now let us consider for a moment what a lie and what a mockery this is. Dominic must have had the suggestion from the Father of Lies himself. But, after all, the Rosary is not so simple a thing for the bookless and illiterate. And here the lie is doubled, when even the professed simplification is lost in a jungle of mysteries. For Dominic considering the variety of subjects in the Psalms, provided a corresponding variety of subjects for meditation during the repetition of the prayers of the Rosary; fifteen mysteries,—five joyful, five dolorous, and five glorious. And there are more Rosaries than one. There is a "Rosary of the Blessed Name of Jesus," and there is a "Rosary of the Blessed Virgin," each of which has its fifteen mysteries.³

¹ Stothert's Glory of Mary, 209-211.

² Ibid., 203.

³ See Stothert's Glory of Mary, *ut supra*; Challoner's Cath. Chr. In-

Little space is now left for notice of those *miscellaneous abominations*, which were mentioned at the commencement of this chapter as forming part of the idolatries of the Church of Rome. There is the less need, perhaps, for a very particular account of any of them, as we have seen already so many things of the most puerile and pitiful character. To such things the soul of the idolater sinks, by a law of nature as certain as the law of gravitation; and in his prostrate degradation he delights to

structed, ch. xxv.; and the Key of Heaven, 293-312. Bishop Challoner says much less about the Blessed Virgin than Mr Stothert does in connection with the Rosary,—each of them in this following the policy of his Church for the time. As we are now to lay aside Mr Stothert's book, it may not be improper to quote the wish or prayer of his concluding paragraph. It shews how the confidence of a Popish soul is given to Mary. Jesus is named as it were in mere compliment. "*And when the strife and tumult are over, and we are about to pass into the presence of our Judge, O that she may speak good for us to the King; that HER smile may refresh us, HER shadow protect us in the weakness and languor of sinking nature; that the names of Jesus and Mary may be the latest to dwell on our lips, the first of eternal praise; that SHE may shorten our purification, and after our exile may shew us her Blessed Son Jesus!*" Such is Popery, although those who have not seriously inquired into it, find it hard to suppose that it is anything so monstrous. If I seem to quote too many passages from Popish books, it is because I wish the reader to have a proper notion of what they really contain and teach; and as we are now to pass from this important subject of the worship of the Virgin Mary, I shall add yet one other sentence from Liguori, and a little hymn:—"Let us always beseech her," says the saint, "BY THE MERITS OF HER BLESSED DEATH to obtain for us a happy death; and should such be the good pleasure of God, let us beg her to obtain for us the grace to die on a Saturday, which is a day dedicated to her honour, or on a day of a novena; or within the octave of one of her feasts; for this she has obtained for so many of her clients, and especially for Saint Stanislaus Kotska, for whom she obtained that he should die on the feast of her Assumption, as Father Bartoli relates in his life." (Liguori's Glories of Mary, 360, 361.) The hymn, to which the Church is still more perfectly committed, is an equally complete denial of Christ.

Si quaeris coelum, anima,
 Mariae nomen invoca
 Mariam invocantibus
 Coelestis patet janua.

multiply them; they are congenial to his dark, and enslaved, and besotted state. He blesses and exorcises, or rather he gets the priest to do it for him,—the priest who, as the possessor of a tremendous power, comes between him and God. He trusts in bell-ringing as a thing of sovereign efficacy against evil spirits, and that the bells may give a proper holy sound, he must have them baptised or blessed. He trusts in holy water, and much sprinkling of holy water he finds to be needful accordingly. Blessed wax is made into blessed candles, and the burning of it gives great consolation to his poor bewildered mind. He thinks it beneficial to perform certain ceremonies once a year with

Ad Mariæ nomen coelites
Laetantur, tremunt inferi,
Coelum, tellus, et æquora
Totusque mundus jubilat.
Culpæ fugantur, tenebrae,
Morbi, dolores, ulcera;
Vinctis solvuntur compedes,
Nautis mitescunt æquora.
Gloria Mariæ Filiae
Patris, et Matri Geniti,
Sponsæque Sancti Spiritus,
Per sæculorum sæcula.

But “the Church” is now anxious to promote to the utmost the “honour” of the Virgin Mary, and just as these sheets are going through the press, the *Tablet*, Romish newspaper, announces the erection of an Association of our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette, in the chapel of Notre Dame de La Salette, at Stratford-on-Avon, by a decree of a personage calling himself “*William Bernard, by the Grace of God and the favour of the Apostolic See, Bishop of Birmingham.*” And this the said William Bernard, otherwise called Dr Ullathorne, professes to do, amongst other reasons, for the honour of the Virgin, and in order to manifest “confidence in the efficacy of invoking her intercession under the title of ‘Our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette,’”—a title which it seems the present Pope has given her, thereby adopting and patronising one of the vilest impostures of recent times,—the story of the miraculous appearance of the Virgin at La Salette, near Grenoble,—a story which Dr Ullathorne also must now be held as adopting and employing. And “Our Lady” has got a new title! the gift of the present Pope! She is henceforth to be invoked as Our Lady of Reconciliation of La Salette!!

branches of trees, which are blessed for the great occasion. He has confidence in the blessing of cattle, and in the blessing of eggs, and attends with great devotion upon these solemnities.

Of some of these things Mr Keenan speaks in his *Controversial Catechism*, but very briefly, under the title of *Ceremonies of the Church*, and defends them as contributing to the solemnity and grandeur of God’s service, and as authorised by that text of Scripture which says, “Let all things be done decently and according to order.”¹ A few specimens will sufficiently illustrate both his subject and his argument.

“Why are ashes distributed on Ash Wednesday, the first day of Lent? To remind us that we are only dust and ashes, and that we ought to enter upon that season, in which Jesus was humbled and mortified for our sake, with an humble and mortified spirit.”

“Why are bread, wine, eggs, and other things blessed? To induce the Almighty to shower down his benedictions upon those who use them.”²

What notions are here exhibited of the Almighty and his grace! But such notions have been animadverted upon already. Let us proceed. We have now another argument.

“Does the Scripture allow the sanctifying or blessing of inanimate things? Certainly; for St Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5, says, ‘Every creature of God is good, . . . for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.’”

And this argument is repeated with reference to holy water.

“May holy water be used under the New Law? Certainly; for every creature of God may be sanctified by the word of God and prayer. (1 Tim. iv. 5.)”³

I say nothing of the real meaning of this text, which is so obvious that the perversion of it to the justification of holy water and blessed eggs is perhaps as extraordinary as anything of the kind which Rome’s advocates have ever perpetrated.

Cardinal Wiseman has published a book on the offices and ceremonies of *Holy Week*. Let us look into the office for *Palm Sunday*, the Sunday of that week. There we find that branches

¹ So he quotes it. 1 Cor. xiv. 14.

² Keenan, Controv. Cat., chap. xii.

³ Ibid.

of palm and olive trees, (in default of which, however, in cold climates, other branches are substituted,) are to be blessed, and distributed, and borne in procession, whilst a sacramental or more than sacramental virtue is ascribed to them, according to these prayers:—

“We beseech thee, O holy Lord, almighty Father, eternal God, to vouchsafe to bless + and sanctify this olive which thou hast created and hast produced from the wood, and which the dove returning to the ark, brought in its mouth: that all those who receive of it may be protected in soul and body; and may it become, O Lord, a remedy towards our salvation, as it is the sign of this favour.”

“O God, who dost gather what is dispersed . . . bless + likewise these branches of palm and olive, which thy servants receive faithfully in honour of thy name; that, into whatever place they may be brought, those who dwell in that place may obtain thy blessing, and all adversity being expelled” . . . &c., &c.¹

But this is only a part. There is still more crossing and blessing of the branches of palm and olive, incensing them, sprinkling them with holy water, giving of them by the clergy to one another, and then to the laity, who receive them kneeling, and kiss them,—not forgetting first to kiss the priest’s hand which gives them. And God is actually entreated, *through Christ our Lord*, to sanctify them with his heavenly blessing, *that they may profit all his people unto salvation.*² This it is which Popish authors venture to defend on the ground of doing things decently and according to order, or by the text which tells us that “every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer.”

On *Holy Saturday*, the Saturday of *Holy Week*, there is in

¹ Husenbeth’s Missal for the use of the Laity, pp. 246, 247. See also a tract on Palm Sunday, in the “Library of Christian Devotion,” published “by permission,” by Burns and Lambert, 17 Portman Street, London, 1851.

² 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5. Mr Keenan does not quote the whole text. (See above.) So much the worse for the moral aspect of his argument.

like manner, a prodigious blessing of fires and lights. The following is the commencement of the office:—

“A fire is struck from a flint outside the church, and coals are kindled from it. The priest with his ministers proceeds to the porch or entrance of the church and blesses the fire as follows:—

V. Our Lord be with you.

R. And with thy spirit.¹

Let us pray.

Prayer. O God, who hast bestowed on thy faithful the fire of thy brightness, by thy Son, who is the corner-stone; sanctify this new fire produced from the flint, that it may prove serviceable to us,” &c., &c.²

In this combination of miserable trifling, man’s ridiculous invention, with things so glorious and awful and with prayer to almighty God, there is profanity, from the very contemplation of which the Christian soul shrinks. But the office for Holy Saturday contains more and more of it, with repetitions and variations. Five grains of incense are blessed, a *thurible* is filled with coals from the fire, the fire and the incense are sprinkled with holy water, they are also incensed thrice. “The Deacon lights one of the three candles, which he holds upon a reed, at the entrance of the church, and kneeling on one knee with the priests and the attendants, except the cross-bearer, he sings alone,—

“The light of Christ.

R. Thanks be to God.³”

By and bye the five grains of blessed incense are fixed in the candle, *in the form of a cross*.—But time and patience utterly fail to go over all the particulars of these ceremonies.

It may be proper, however, to say something of Holy Water, which performs so important a part in almost all the rites and services of the Popish Church, and which is directly borrowed from the heathenism of the ancient Romans. The water is mingled with salt, and the salt and the water receive separate benedictions. There is also an exorcism of the salt, and an ex-

¹ Of course, all this is in Latin.

² Husenbeth’s Missal for the use of the Laity, 316.

³ Ibid., 317.

orcism of the water before they are mingled. One of these exorcisms I shall here quote.

“The Exorcism of the Salt.

“I exorcise thee, O creature of salt, by the living + God, by the true + God, by the holy + God; by that God who, by the prophet Elisha, commanded thee to be cast into the water to cure its barrenness, that thou mayest by this exorcism be made beneficial to the faithful, and become to all them who make use of thee, healthful both to soul and body; and that in what place soever thou shalt be sprinkled, all illusions and wickedness and crafty wiles of Satan may be chased away and depart from that place, and every unclean spirit commanded in his name, who is to come to judge the living and the dead, and the world by fire. Amen.”¹

The other exorcism is similar to this: it gives power to the water over the devil to put him and all his apostate angels to flight: and the salt and the water are mingled (with three crossings) “in the name of the Father +, and of the Son +, and of the Holy + Ghost.”

An elaborate defence has been written by the authoress of *Geraldine*² of that most ridiculous rite, the annual *Benediction of Horses* at Rome, at the convent of St Anthony, where a priest sprinkles holy water by means of a brush upon such animals as are for that purpose presented to him, the owners paying him a certain fee for his trouble. I know not that any British Papist has yet done the same service for the Festival of the Ass, which used to be celebrated in the Gallican Church at Beauvais in Burgundy, in which a girl was decked out in finery and placed on an ass superbly caparisoned to represent the Virgin Mary fleeing into Egypt; and the ass, attended by a vast concourse of clergy and laity, was led in solemn procession to a church, where high mass was celebrated, the girl now sitting near the altar and the ass kneeling, which trick he had been trained to perform, whilst a hymn was sung in his praise, and, finally, the officiating priest brayed three times, and the people replied by braying three times in concert.³ But some approach has re-

¹ Challoner's Cath. Christ. Instr., chap. xxviii.

² *Geraldine*, III., 47, &c.

³ Scottish Protestant, I., 154-156. One verse of this hymn is,—

cently been made to a revival of this *solemnity* in England, when Dr Hendren, one of the Popish bishops, made the circuit of his cathedral on Christmas day, dressed out in his episcopal robes, riding upon an ass, and moving to the music of the choir!¹

It was my intention to have concluded this chapter by some further illustrations of that fearful trifling in worship which characterises so many of the offices of the Church of Rome. But I must refrain, the less reluctantly because so many illustrations of it have been already presented in incidental connection with other points. I think it more necessary to take further notice of the idolatry perpetrated under the very name of the worship of Jesus, when either his humanity is worshipped apart from his divinity, or when mere parts of his humanity are separately adored and supplicated. For this is no true worship of Christ, and herein Rome witnesses against herself when, holding up the *sacrament* as an object of the highest worship, she proclaims it to be, and every separated particle of the bread and drop of the wine to be, whole Christ, his body, soul, and divinity. Whoever directs his devotions to the body of Christ, or to his blood, or to his soul, or to his heart, worships an object to which he cannot wisely or in true faith say, “My Lord and my God.”

There is a very evident division of the person of Christ, and separate deification of the parts in the prayer called *Amina Christi*, which begins,—

“Soul of Christ sanctify me,
Body of Christ save me,
Blood of Christ inebriate me,
Water of the side of Christ wash me.”²

We meet very frequently in Popish books with mention of the

“Ecce magnis auribus
Subjugatis filius!
Asinus egregius,
Asinorum Dominus.”

¹ Scottish Protestant, I., 157.

² I give it as translated in the Translation of the Spiritual Exercises of St Ignatius Loyola, to which it is prefixed.

Sacred Heart of Jesus. There are prayers to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, acts of consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, a litany of the Sacred Heart, &c.¹ And as in these devotions, sometimes Jesus is addressed and sometimes his Sacred Heart, the multiplication of deities is made more obvious. But not only is the heart of Jesus thus separately adored. The heart of the Virgin Mary is the object of a like adoration, and there are prayers to the Heart of the Virgin, exercises to the Afflicted Heart of the Virgin, &c. Nay, this has been found to be, amongst certain classes of persons, at certain periods of history, one of the most inflaming and exciting forms of Popish idolatry.

Along with idolatry of the kind now described, I would class that which assumes the form of prayers *to the child Jesus*, or which makes the Divine Saviour specially the object of worship now, not as what he is, but as what he was in the early days of his earthly life. Children are taught to pray to the *child Jesus*;² it is thought to be suitable to their age, and it has attractions for their fancy. Many of the saints are said to have been favoured with visions of the Virgin Mary, and of the infant Jesus along with her. And Cardinal Wiseman requests us to believe, concerning St John Joseph of the Cross, that "on Christmas night, and other times besides, the infant Jesus descended into his arms, prolonging his stay for several hours."³

Nothing is more easy than to see that all the parts of Popish idolatry are connected together, one growing out of another. An unspiritual religion can never be a satisfactory religion. The devotee must always feel that there is a want,—not merely personal, such as the truly devout man feels who trusts in Jesus Christ, and worships God aright, but in his religion itself. The efforts of the self-righteous man can never bring him perfect or true peace: But the more that he is in earnest, the more that he feels a need for such efforts at all, the more is he discontented

¹ See Key of Heaven, 209, &c.

² Child's Manual, p. 92.

³ Lives of Saints of 26th May 1839, p. 150.

with himself in all his performances, and so his toils and penances are multiplied, and he cannot rest, continually turning with new hope to some new invention of asceticism. Thus too the idolater multiplies his deities, glad to look for help and refuge to some new quarter, because he feels that all is not yet well, and knows not him who, to his true believing people, is *a refuge and a strength, a very present help in trouble*. And when the Virgin Mary is represented as enjoying a peculiar and superior exaltation, and as invested with prerogatives and attributes really divine, it is precisely what an unspiritual man would fain have,—a deity sufficiently powerful and sufficiently kind, able and ready to help, but without those other divine attributes which the unrenewed soul cannot regard with complacency. Man shrinks from God; and in truth he does not seek through the Virgin Mary to draw near to God, as those do through Christ who really know Christ and God as he is in Christ,—but he seeks to hide himself *from* God under the shadow of this Queen of Heaven, this new and less terrible deity whom his fancy has created.

Idolatry grows naturally out of self-righteousness. The tendency to idolatry, which all ages have witnessed, proceeds from the deep-seated self-righteousness of the human heart. And that which is the source of Popery viewed with reference to individuals, must also be regarded as the source of it historically, and with reference to the world at large. Man feels himself guilty before God, even when he does not properly feel nor fully acknowledge his guilt; he labours to make himself righteous, seeking refuge in walls of his own building and daubing, and amidst crowds of imagined deities, whom he expects to do something for him which he cannot do for himself. When the mystery of iniquity wrought in the Apostolic age, undermining the gospel system of justification by faith in Jesus Christ alone, and setting up a religion of trust in rites and ceremonial observances,—idolatry was already there in the germ. From trust in rites and ceremonies, it was an easy step to the introduction of a priesthood. And the priesthood being interposed betwixt God

and the people, the introduction of another class of beings superior to the priests was a natural and likely consequence.

Self-righteousness implies the existence of false and low notions of God. No self-righteous man could retain any hope at all, if he had a proper view of God's holiness, justice, and truth. When a man once obtains this new discovery of God, it brings him to Christ. In order then to any hope in self-righteousness, God must be represented as somewhat like ourselves. This leads to lower notions still, and so proves an inlet to idolatry. That God whom men fear and whose attributes they try to reduce to something more congenial to their own feelings and wishes, is still too glorious, too dreadful. But the subordinate deities with whom they now begin to people heaven are in every way more like themselves. It seems easier to please them than to please the Most High God, and then through them his favour is to be obtained. Meanwhile, low notions of one kind lead to low notions of another kind, till everything becomes sensuous, and a religion which still affects the name is found to be of a nature most opposite to Christianity, and instead of elevating the soul by its influence, binds it down more closely amidst the very mire and slime of this earth.